

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 3.—JULY, 1889.

I.

OUR MISSION AS A DENOMINATION.

BY THOMAS G. APPLE, D.D., LL.D.

THE recent and present agitation of the question of a union of the two Reformed Churches of this country brings home to us the challenge anew, whether we have a mission sufficient to justify the maintenance of a separate denominational existence, or whether it would not be better for such denominations as ours and the Dutch Reformed Church to seek union with each other, and ultimately, perhaps, with the Presbyterian Church, so as to lessen the divisions in the family of Reformed churches in this country. It may, indeed, be asked why such a question is raised just at this time. Our German Reformed Church is one of the original churches of the Reformation, dating its origin to the Palatinate, Germany, in 1563, when the Heidelberg Catechism was framed as our confession in distinction from the Lutheran Church of Germany. Our distinct and separate existence in this country dates back to 1747, when the first *Coetus* was organized, though we had congregational organizations as early as 1720-27. Our church was planted in this Western world, under Divine Providence, somewhat in

the same way the Puritan Church was established in New England, by immigrants who fled to escape the persecutions in the fatherland, and ever since the German Reformed Church in this country, together with the Lutheran Church, has been charged with caring for the religious interests of the Protestant German immigration to the New World. It has, indeed, grown to be at present prevailingly an English church, and quite as much American as the Presbyterian and Episcopal Churches of this country, but it still retains its Anglo-German spirit and life, and through that portion which continues to worship in the German language it seeks to provide for the wants of that portion of the Protestant German population of this country that adheres to the Reformed faith. Considering the circumstances of its origin and history, it has enjoyed a commendable growth and prosperity, and has kept pace, proportionably, with any of the other Protestant denominations of this country.

With patient and faithful labor and industry it has organized and endowed literary and theological institutions, and provided all the other appliances necessary for its denominational work, maintaining successful and prosperous missions in the home and foreign fields. Through a period of very earnest, and at times excited, controversy, it has come to a clear and full consciousness of its peculiar denominational spirit and life. It has wrought out a theology and cultus of its own, and its members are generally prepared to answer the question, *Why am I Reformed?* quite as intelligently as members generally of any other Protestant body in this country, in reference to their peculiar denomination. And this, too, not merely by knowing and asserting our original confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, our historical position of over three centuries ago, but by an apprehension of our true historical development and our relation to other Protestant bodies in this country in the present nineteenth century.

Our prospects for future growth are quite as encouraging as those of other similar denominations around us. Considering our increase from ONE to EIGHT distinct Synods within about

fifty years, the condition of our institutions and various organizations and appliances for aggressive work, and the prospect for increase in membership, especially in the great West, through the emigration of our own people from the East, and the foreign German population there, which is constantly growing through immigration from the fatherland, and the provision for the religious wants of this foreign immigration through our German Synods and growing German ministry, we feel assured that our Reformed Church has as fair and prosperous a future before it as any other denomination in this country.

Why, then, raise the question just at this time of union with another denomination? Not, I answer, because our church is in any peril as a denomination, not because we are in any danger of denominational bankruptcy, or because our special mission as a denomination has come to an end. We have quite as clear and strong a call to work out our mission as a denomination to-day as in any past time in our history. The question has come to us solely from the general spirit of union which is agitating all the churches, the question whether the time has not come for Protestant bodies to unite their strength against the common enemy. The Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian system throughout the world, organized since 1876, has, no doubt, served to stimulate this sentiment of union among churches of the Reformed family, and as a consequence the two Reformed Churches of this country—the German and the Dutch—have been led to consider whether they could not work out their special mission better by a union of their strength, and thus lead the way in a closer union of all the Reformed churches in this and other lands.

There may, indeed, be those among us who regard the question from an economic, or merely utilitarian, standpoint, who, considering our comparative weakness in numbers, and the prospect of our being overshadowed by the few larger denominations of the country, imagine that for our own self-preservation and self-assertion, some such union as the one proposed with the Reformed Church in America, would be a wise stroke

of policy ; but we do not believe this sentiment is general, nor that it is at all correct. There is no other denomination in this country that has a clearer, or better-founded, consciousness of its peculiar denominational spirit and calling than our own, and none that has better reason, all things considered, to be encouraged with the prospects for the future spread out before us.

This consciousness of our special denominational calling began to be revived about a century after our organization as a separate and independent church in this country, about the time our literary and theological institutions were established, about fifty years ago, and it became intensified by the discussions through which the Church passed for a period of a quarter of a century that followed. Those discussions in the beginning were concerned specially with the foundations of our own denomination, "the spirit and genius of the Heidelberg Catechism," and along with this our historical customs and usages, the meaning and value of catechization, of educational religion and Christian nurture, growing out of the covenant signed and sealed in baptism, but coming during the time of the *Tractarian movement* in England, they reached out gradually to "The Principle of Protestantism," and then to the fundamental substance of Christianity itself, as this centres in the Person of Christ. Though attended with perils, and drawing into them one-sided and extreme views, and at times threatening the division of the Church, yet they were highly educational for our people, as well as for the ministry. The Liturgical controversy that formed the last phase of these discussions, afforded the Church an opportunity to become fully acquainted with the subject of *Cultus*. Our people learned to know the merits of both sides of the question of liturgical worship, from the first report on this subject, submitted to the Synod at Norristown in 1849, till the last report of the Peace Commission at Baltimore in 1884.

It may be proper, now that the question of union with another denomination is challenging our consideration, to place clearly before our minds our mission as a Denomination. Not

that this would be lost by such union, for these two bodies are sufficiently similar in their historical spirit and life to leave room for the denominational mission of each in the union, at least measurably; but whether this contemplated union is consummated or not, the time and the question are a challenge to reconsider the meaning of our call and mission as a denominational factor in the Protestant Church of this country. If this proposed union should not be consummated, or, as is most likely, postponed for some time, it will do us good to make the question an occasion to reconsider what is our special line of work as we go forward still alone and independent as a denomination; and if the union should be consummated, it is proper to consider what positive elements we are to carry into the union; for if the union should take place at all, it should not be merely external and economic, but it should grow into a positive spirit and life that will gather up into itself the best elements in each denomination, something stronger and better than either, or both, separately taken.

I.

Internally we are called to assert and maintain a sound progressive theology. This is, indeed, a part of the mission of every denomination. Yet each denomination, if it possess a self-conscious life, should maintain its own phase of sound doctrine.

OUR REFORMED CHURCH CHRISTOLOGICAL.

If now we ask, what is the outcome of our theological development up to the present time in our denominational history, we may perhaps best gather it up in that characteristic of our theology which we are accustomed to designate as CHRISTOLOGICAL.

At the funeral of that beloved teacher and father in our church, Rev. Dr. J. W. Nevin, in 1886, the writer, in his funeral oration, referred to this as distinguishing the theological teaching of him whose body we were about to consign to its

resting-place in the grave. Rev. Dr. A. A. Hodge, then Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the Presbyterian Seminary at Princeton, who followed in a feeling and able address, said that he wished, on that solemn occasion, to record himself also, with Dr. Nevin, as holding the Christological principle in theology. And so we now hear from other quarters, and other theological centres, the same assertion. In the Alliance of Reformed churches whenever this principle is referred to it meets a hearty response.

Of course it has different meanings, and in that view it may be regarded as too general and vague to be made a characteristic of any particular system of theology. Still it is coming to be a rallying point for theologians, and the more it is studied and elaborated, the more it will prove itself to be the only true centre for all sound theology. Since the time of Schleiermacher, a Reformed theologian of Germany, it has come to obtain a more or less definite meaning.

It asserts and means that the person of Christ is the central principle in theology, as well as the substance of Christianity. Other centres have been sought and found. As an example, when Coccejus, in the early development of post-Reformation Reformed theology sought for some principle of revelation in the Bible, some principle around which as a living centre all the parts of the historic revelation recorded in the Bible organize themselves, he at last found this in *the COVENANT*, and so for a time a species of Reformed theology came to be styled the *Federal theology*, and its adherents the *Federal School*, from *fœdus*, a covenant. That was a step of progress, for instead of finding the Bible a concatenation of revealed oracles, all on one plane, without historic growth and development, he conceived of that book at least as a living organism, which must have some centre, around which all its parts revolve. Instead of taking the abstract will of God, the divine decrees, as this centre, he found it in the idea of the *Covenant*, and so he had a new centre from which to study all the parts. But if we ask any student in the theological schools of the Reformed Church now, what is the

centre of the revelation contained in the Bible, he will unhesitatingly answer, *The Person of Christ*. The old theology which regarded Christ as the *means*, or instrument of salvation, is now complemented by saying that the person of Christ is also, and especially, *the source* of salvation, a difference which itself is sufficient to revolutionize the whole system of theology. So in the Lutheran theology the doctrine of justification by faith alone was made the centre, and the latest and most plausible phase of presenting this centre in theology is now styled the *Christian Consciousness*, a very sound principle, at least on the subjective side, but not the *central* principle. The inspired Scriptures, the only rule of faith and practice, especially in Reformed theology, occupied this first *Locus*, in distinction from the Lutheran, but this is not the *central* principle.

It is by no means our purpose to attempt to show how, starting from this Christological principle, the whole system of Dogmatic Theology must organize itself anew, but simply to state the fact. As the true unity of the church starts and holds in all believers partaking of the life of Christ, he the ever-living head, they the living members of "his body, which is the church," so this central principle must organize our knowledge of God objectively in Creed, Confession and Theology. This calls for, not new material of revelation, not so much new dogmas, but, a new centre around which to organize and interpret all dogmas. The problem is but newly opening in our day, but it is destined, in our judgment, to go on expanding until our theology comes to greater harmony and satisfaction throughout the Protestant world. Let any one from this stand-point attempt to write out a thesis on the doctrine of the Atonement, or of Justification by Faith, or on any topic in Eschatology, and he will soon find what power it has to bring the desired solution. Starting with the Person of Christ as the Generic Head of the new race, the different theories of the Atonement, one by one, come in for their place, but all gather now around a new centre, which illumines them all, and at the same time deprives them of their one-sidedness, and so far forth, their error.

What we mean to assert here is, that our Reformed Church has a theology of its own, and a theology which, however imperfect and incomplete as yet in its elaboration, it believes is worth living for as a denomination—a theology which we believe is rapidly coming to rule in the theological world, both in Europe and America.

And this, we may say, is in full harmony with the Heidelberg Catechism. In some respects, indeed, that Catechism does not succeed in explaining all phases of doctrine according to the Christological principle. For example, the doctrine of the Atonement is explained according to the Juridical theory of Anselm, good and true so far as it goes, yet giving only one side, or phase, of the Atonement; but beyond what they knew at the time the framers of the Catechism builded their system on the foundation of the Person of Christ. This comes, no doubt, from their taking the Apostles' Creed as containing the Christian faith *in sum*, as containing all essential things necessary for a Christian to believe; for in that Creed the person of Christ is central, the formative principle that determines the whole organism of that Symbol. In saying, therefore, that our theology is Christological, we say that it is in full accord with the teaching of the Heidelberg Catechism.

II.

We have reached a satisfactory settlement on the subject of *CULTUS*. When we say "a satisfactory settlement," we do not mean a full or ultimate settlement, for on this as on all other elements of its life and history the church is constantly making progress, and reaching out after a fuller understanding of the subject in hand.

The discussions on the general subject of *Cultus* in our church included not only worship in the restricted sense of the word, but also the subject of the *church year*, including the celebration of festival days, such as Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, etc., and also the outline of lessons for the church year, the pericopes, which have come down to us from the primitive age of

Christianity. The tendency in the time of the Reformation, and immediately afterwards, was to cast off the observance of church festivals, because they had been so multiplied in the Roman Catholic Church that the Christian Sunday became overshadowed by them. But in studying this subject, it was found that the abuse of what is good is no valid reason for rejecting the proper use of such good, whatever it may be. The church year is based upon a natural and proper want in the sphere of our religious life, just as the natural year with its seasons and the political year, in their spheres. Moreover it was seen that the lessons of the church year offered a better study of the Scriptures than any other arbitrary or subjective scheme that might be introduced in their place.

The conclusion reached was that these lessons should be retained as a general outline, without being mechanically or slavishly bound by them in preaching, and the General Synod finally recommended the observance of at least five great festivals—Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Pentecost and Ascension Day. While the custom is not entirely uniform, and a certain degree of liberty is allowed, yet the church is more and more settling down in the religious observance of these days; and we believe the general tendency in the other branches of the Reformed Church throughout the world is setting in in the same direction. We might dwell upon the educational power of the observance of the church year, did our space allow, but the subject has been so fully elaborated by other writers, from time to time, that there is little or no occasion for this in the present article.

In regard to the use of liturgical forms in worship it might at first view appear as if the whole subject is most unsettled, and yet upon a closer consideration it is evident that the church has reached a relative settlement that is quite satisfactory. There has never really been any difference in regard to the use of a liturgy in such services as the administration of the Sacraments and on other extraordinary occasions. The difference has turned on the liturgical or non-liturgical service for the

Lord's day. In the adoption of the Directory the church has given its endorsement of a full liturgical service, while it sanctions also a free service for those congregations that prefer it. The full liturgical service is the same as in the Order of Worship, except that the repetition of the Creed comes immediately after the reading lesson, instead of the place before the singing of the Gloria, and a modification of the wording of the Absolution. There is also a more brief liturgical form provided for those who desire it.

This conclusion of the long controversy on the liturgy has given rest and peace to the church. The time may come when one service will be used in all the congregations, but the use of free prayer will no doubt always be allowed. With this degree of liberty there can be no occasion for further strife on this subject. If the tendency in the direction of liturgical worship which seems to prevail in all the Reformed Churches should finally settle down in the use of a liturgical service on the Lord's day, our church will not therefore be behind, but rather be in the lead. So far as the doctrinal points in the liturgy are concerned there is a full settlement, and now the only question that remains pertains to the perfecting of the forms we have.

The Lutheran Church is still engaged in preparing a liturgy on which all their divisions may unite, and the Dutch Reformed are also engaged in completing their liturgy. A liturgy, fully as much as a catechism, or confession, is a bond of union in a denomination, and in this view it seems desirable that in the main all our churches should have one *order*, but uniformity in all the details should not be enforced, nor perhaps is it desirable.

Our conclusion, therefore, is that our church has made great progress in settling its theology and its cultus, and with harmony on these subjects we may certainly feel satisfied with our position as a denomination.

On the subject of the divine decrees, or predestination, upon which the church has been more or less divided since the days of

Augustine and Pelagius, we may say that our position is moderate and conservative. The teaching of the catechism on the general doctrine of sin and grace is Augustinian, and a positive election to salvation is implied, but there is nothing said in regard to a decree of reprobation, which even Calvin pronounced a *decretum horribile*. The truth is that all the reformers, including Luther, held to the doctrine of predestination, simply because they all followed the Augustinian theology over against the semi-Pelagianism of the Roman Catholic Church, and the Heidelberg Catechism was, therefore, interpreted from the beginning as a Calvinistic symbol, but just because it is a catechism and not a Confession in the strict sense of the word, it is less explicit than the Calvinistic Confessions. This fact might be regarded as a weakness in that it emphasizes strict denominationalism less, and accordingly some have contended that we lack denominational devotion; but on the other hand it may be regarded also as our strength, especially in an age such as the present, when less stress is laid upon denominational peculiarities, and more upon the essentials that all denominations hold in common. Our catechism allows a measure of freedom just upon those points of Calvinism that have created controversies, and the tendency at present in all the Calvinistic Churches is in the same direction, *i.e.*, against too close and too strict definitions on a subject which all allow is involved more or less in mystery. We may hold to the divine sovereignty and to man's free agency, but still regard their reconciliation at the bar of finite reason as beyond our ability. We may, therefore, regard it as an advantage that we have a catechism, but strictly speaking not a confession. The Presbyterian Church of England has already modified the Westminster Confession on this subject, and the Scotch Presbyterian Churches are moving in the same direction, and practically the same liberty is allowed in the Presbyterian Churches of this country. No one who reads the signs of the times can fail to see that the tendency everywhere now is to broaden and generalize the creeds and confessions rather than to particularize and restrict them. And this

we believe can be done in the interest of Christian union without falling into the danger of latitudinarianism, or the giving up of any of the fundamental doctrines of salvation. As a learned Dutch Reformed divine said in the Philadelphia Convention on church union, we may still guard the outposts of denominationalism, but lay more stress on the central citadel of defense, which is the person of Christ. In that way the good gained in the development of denominational points of doctrine may be conserved—held in reserve, so to speak, whenever new dangers may threaten, but held in proper subordination to that which is central in the Christian faith. And now, therefore, when the tendency towards church co-operation and church union is predominant, we may rejoice that our Catechism presents a basis on which all Reformed Churches may stand together and in union. This problem of church union may have to be referred to the next generation, and to the XXth century, but that it is ripening for solution no one can doubt.

III.

We turn now to consider our mission as a denomination on the *practical side*. The two go together, the doctrinal and the practical, the one is essential to the other. There are, indeed, those who seem determined to lay all stress solely on the one or the other. At one time all stress is laid on theology, our inner mission in soundly indoctrinating the church; at another time the tendency is to concentrate all interest on the practical work of increasing the membership and of missions, etc. These two, the theoretical and the practical, the outer and the inner mission, ought to go together, for both are equally important. Before we get to the practical work of the church there is a section to be considered that belongs to both the doctrinal and the practical. We refer to our idea of educational religion, and our custom of catechization and confirmation. We receive this as handed down from the early times of the Reformed Church in the Palatinate, when one of the important uses of the cate-

chism was in relation to the careful training of the young in the church.

At one time in our history this method of preparing the young for reception to the communion was imperilled by the New Measure System, so called, according to which protracted meetings took the place of catechetical instruction, and preparation for reception into the church was made to consist in a sudden conversion without careful instruction, and often through immoderate excitement of the religious feelings. But our church soon recovered itself from this temporary danger, and it has since continued to cling the more earnestly to its time-honored custom.

Other Reformed Churches have fallen away from this custom of catechization, viz., the Presbyterian, and, we believe, also the Dutch Reformed. When we read lately the statement of a Dutch Reformed minister in the *Independent*, that the Heidelberg Catechism in his church was a mere relic of the past, and no longer exerted any influence, although we regarded the statement as an exaggeration, if not an utter misrepresentation, we said to ourselves, this means that the catechism is no longer used as it once was in that church for the catechization of the young. This, indeed, in its main use and source of influence in our church. If it were left merely to be preached upon from the pulpit, as is the law in the Dutch church, we doubt whether it would have very much interest among us; but place it in the hands of the pastor as catechist, with his young people before him in the catechetical class, and it at once becomes a living practical power. This regard for the baptized membership of the church, treating and training them as in the covenant, not outside of it, and their faithful instruction in the catechism is one of the special features in our church-life and work. Our mission as a denomination requires us to hold fast to this idea and custom. There is no other means so well adapted to reach the young and hold them in the church. Even the other appliances that are now being employed, such as Young Men's Christian Associations, brotherhoods, etc., must

be carefully subordinated to the catechetical class. We might dwell upon this topic, in its doctrinal and practical aspects, but it is so familiar to our church that this is not called for: all that we have aimed at is to hold it up to attention as a most important part of our denominational peculiarities, and so a part of our special mission as a denomination.

Without caring to observe any particular logical order in the treatment of the practical work of our church, we may notice next the claim upon us of the *mission field*—home and foreign—and their relative or comparative importance. Our Home Mission work is peculiar, in that it has to do so largely with the German population in our country. As our church owes its origin to the Palatinate, as well as German Switzerland, it would be strange indeed if we did not feel strongly attracted to our brethren from the Fatherland who are annually coming to our shores. And it is most fortunate that our organization includes such effective means and appliances for work among the Germans. We have German ministers, German Classes, German Synods and German collegiate and theological institutions, all united with the English portion of the church under one General Synod. In one sense we have thus a foreign field at home—that is, we have a special call to provide for the religious wants of our brethren from the Fatherland who come to settle in this new world. They are educated*and have received Christian training in their native land, but they are in need of church privileges and ministers to break unto them the bread of life. Without a German ministry to meet their wants, and aid in building churches, they would become lost to the church altogether, or else wander into other folds.

It is easy to see from this brief reference to the subject that our Home Mission work is peculiar, and that it has more than ordinary claims upon us.

That we are called to labor in the foreign field also no one will question who understands at all the spirit of Christianity; and our remarkable success in so short a time in Japan may be taken as a clear indication of Providence that we dare not

neglect our call in that direction. But it is equally evident, we think, that the interest in the foreign field should not be allowed to overshadow the vast importance of the home missionary work. There are denominations that have less work to do in the home field, and they should do all the more in the foreign field, but with us it is different.

Here certainly there is opened up a mission for our denomination which Providence has clearly placed before us, and we would be recreant to our sacred trust and inheritance if we should, in any wise, neglect it. In it we may at once see a reason why God planted our church in this western world.

And now, if we clearly have a definite mission in maintaining the trust confided to us in our Reformed faith, which grew up not by chance, but under an overruling Providence in the Reformation, and in the great work of Home and Foreign Missions, there are certain other things that logically follow.

One is that we need efficient, well-equipped and well-endowed preparatory schools, colleges and seminaries, to educate the young for their callings, and especially to provide a ministry to carry on this great work. Institutions of other denominations cannot do this work for us. Our calling as a denomination requires that we should maintain our denominational life and spirit.

Here, too, the guiding hand of Providence is clearly to be seen, in the history of the struggles that attended the founding and growth of these schools of higher education in our church. Some of them at least have been placed upon firm foundations that give assurance of their permanency and prosperity, and they are located generally where they are needed, in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Kansas, North Carolina, etc.

It may be a question whether we need as many theological seminaries as there are colleges. Perhaps one well-endowed and well-equipped seminary in the West, and one in the East, would be sufficient. And the question will no doubt be raised by our descendants, whether each of these might not combine a German and an English faculty in one. That, however, may

well be left for posterity to decide, while for the present the separate German and English seminaries should be well supported.

There has been wonderful progress in our higher institutions within a comparatively recent period, and our church is being rapidly educated up to a due appreciation of their value for the maintenance of our denominational life and the work we have to perform.

Another exponent of our denominational life is the Orphan Homes maintained within our organization. Some might question the necessity of maintaining such institutions in an age and in a country that make provision for such wants in State institutions. But surely no Christian denomination can hand over all its care for its own poor to the State, and even if it does this in part because church people are taxed by the government for this purpose, yet there are always a class of persons whom the church prefers to care for as especially its own, and the very existence of such eleemosynary institutions maintained by the church, has an immense moulding influence on the spiritual life of the people; it serves powerfully to develop the spirit of charity, which is the greatest of Christian virtues. Some churches maintain hospitals in the expression of their care for the afflicted; while ours has instituted these *Orphan Homes*, one at Womelsdorf, Pa., another at Butler, Pa., another at Fort Wayne, Indiana, and still another at Sheboygan. A *Home*, in the truest and best sense of the word for superannuated and disabled indigent ministers is still a *desideratum*. Perhaps the best form of denominational provision for this want would be what the Presbyterian Church is now doing, viz., the raising of a fund sufficient to pension all superannuated and disabled ministers who may need it. This would leave the subject aided the liberty of deciding where he shall reside. Only think of it, the civil government retires its public officers on a salary at a certain age, or upon their being disabled: how much greater obligation rests upon the Church to provide equally for its hard-worked ministers, when they can no longer labor in their sacred office!

Perhaps some readers of the REVIEW may wonder what particular object we have in view in the train of thought we have pursued in this article. They seem like very common-place reflections, he may say, upon the German Reformed Church in general, without saying anything in particular that has not been said as well, if not better, over and over again.

To this we reply that we have not, indeed, aimed to say anything new, but rather simply to call to mind in a certain connection some thoughts which may confirm our attachment to, and our faith in, our own beloved Church, its principles and its calling. And it is proper to do this now when we are earnestly considering the question of union with another denomination. If that union should be consummated, as we hope it may provided it is done in good faith and under right conditions, these reflections will show that we are willing to make some sacrifice for the cause of *church unity*. And if it should not be consummated, at any rate for the present, they will serve to show that we have a church worth living and worth dying for, a church founded in martyr faith and perpetuated in martyr blood. And this latter purpose, especially to meet and answer a certain pessimistic spirit that is wont to make itself heard at times within our borders: "We are, after all, but a small denomination; we cannot hope to rival the larger denominations of the land, and we have nothing special to contribute to the Christianity of the country: what encouragement is there, then, to labor and toil and sacrifice for its maintenance and welfare?" So runs this pessimistic complaint. Surely there must be some spiritual dyspepsia at the foundation of such a melancholy wail.

We have had our denominational controversy, and at times strife, as what church has not? but it has been overruled and made to serve to bring us to a clear consciousness of our distinct mission among the denominations of the country. Our divisions remain now more as an echo of the past than as a present reality. The spirit of union and of church fidelity has triumphed over the divisive influences that at times prevailed,

and never before in our history have we had more encouraging signs of genuine prosperity. Wherever we have had an opportunity of coming into contact with other Reformed Churches throughout the world, as in the Alliance that has now become a permanent and influential Council, wherever our members have come into association with members of other churches in the benevolent and charitable agencies of the day, or our young men, students from college and seminary, have met students from other colleges and seminaries, as in the Inter-seminary Missionary Alliance, in all such and similar experiences we have been made to feel that in spirit and life we are fully abreast with the most progressive and effective agencies of the age for denominational work, and that we have a mission to fulfill. And this is what we need to realize yet more fully. As in our love of country, our patriotism, we need at times great occasions to stimulate our sense of what we are and the work committed to us as a nation, so we need to be stirred up to take in the extent and prospects of our work and mission as a church, in order to be freed from all dyspeptic complainings, and enabled to take a hopeful view of things around us. Not, indeed, to beget narrow sectarian pride or self-conceit, but to awaken in us a pure and hearty love for the church in which Providence has cast our lot, and then through this to have our love for the holy catholic Church increased and our faith enlarged and confirmed.

Let such a love and faith be kindled in the hearts of our intelligent and talented young men, and they will press forward to fill up the ranks of our ministry. With such opportunities for laboring in the highest of all spheres for the welfare of our fellow-men and the glory of God, the question will not be asked, "Is life worth living?" but each will feel that life is only too short for the great work that claims his best energies and his greatest sacrifice. Upon our ability to call out and fill with holy zeal the young men of the church depends largely its welfare and future prosperity; and every one must rejoice at the propitious signs of such an awakening going on just now in our institutions and in our congregations as well.

II.

THE SWISS REFORMATION.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.

Switzerland before the Reformation.

SWITZERLAND belongs to those countries whose historic significance stands in inverse proportion to their size. God often elects small things for great purposes. Palestine gave to the world the Christian religion; from little Greece proceeded philosophy and art; Switzerland is the cradle of the Reformed churches. The land of the snow-capped Alps is the source of mighty rivers and of the Reformed faith, as Germany is the home of the Lutheran faith; and the principles of the Swiss Reformation, like the waters of the Rhine and the Rhone, traveled westward with the course of the sun to France, Holland, England, Scotland, and to a new continent, which Zwingli and Calvin knew only by name. Compared with intellectual and moral achievements, the conquests of the sword dwindle into insignificance. Ideas rule the world; ideas are immortal.

Before the sixteenth century, Switzerland exerted no influence in the affairs of Europe, except by the bravery of its inhabitants in self-defense of their liberty and in foreign wars. But in the sixteenth century she stands next to Germany in that great religious renovation which has affected all modern history.

"The affairs of Switzerland," says Hallam ("Middle Ages," II. 108, Am. ed.), "occupy a very small space in the great chart of European history. But in some respects they are more interesting than the revolutions of mighty kingdoms.

Nowhere besides do we find so many titles to our sympathy, or the union of so much virtue with so complete success. . . . Other nations displayed an insuperable resolution in the defense of walled towns; but the steadiness of the Swiss in the field of battle was without a parallel, unless we recall the memory of Lacedæmon."

The republic of Switzerland, which has maintained itself in the midst of monarchies down to this day, was founded by "the eternal covenant" of the three "forest cantons," Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden, August, 1291, and grew from time to time by conquest, purchase, and free association. Lucerne (the fourth forest canton) joined the confederacy in 1332, Zurich in 1351, Glarus and Zug in 1352, Berne in 1353, Freiburg and Solothurn (Soleur) in 1481, Basle and Schaffhausen in 1499, Appenzell in 1513—making in all thirteen cantons at the time of the Reformation. With them were connected, by purchase or conquest or free consent, as common territories or free bailiwicks,* the adjoining lands of Aargau, Thurgau, Wallis, Geneva, Graubünden (Grisons, Rhätia), the principedom of Neuchâtel and Valengin, and several cities (Biel, Mülhausen, Rotweil, Locarno, etc.). Since 1798 the number of cantons has increased to twenty-two, with a population of nearly three millions (in 1890). The Republic of the United States started with thirteen States, and has grown, likewise by purchase or conquest and the organization and incorporation of new territories, but more rapidly and on a much larger scale.

The romantic story of William Tell, so charmingly told by Aegidius Tschudi, the Swiss Herodotus,† and by Johannes von

* They were called *gemeine Herrschaften* or *Vogteien* and *zugewandte Orte*.

† Or the father of Swiss historiography, as he is also called. His *Chronicon Helveticum* or *Eidgenössische Chronik* (1000-1470), was first edited by Professor Iselin, Basle, 1784 or 1786, in two vols. Aegidius Tschudi, of Glarus (b. 1605-1672) derived the Tell legend from the *Weisse Buch* of Sarnen, and Etterlin of Lucerne, and adorned it with his fancy and masterly power of narration. He was a pupil of Zwingli, but remained in the old church. In a letter to Zwingli, February, 1517, he says: "*Non cum aliquo docto libentius esse velim, quam tecum.*" *Zw. Opera* VII. 21. The MS. of his *Chronik* is preserved in the city

Müller, the Swiss Tacitus, and embellished by the poetic genius of Friedrich Schiller, must be abandoned to the realm of popular fiction, like the cognate stories of Scandinavian and German mythology, but contains, nevertheless, an abiding element of truth, as setting forth the spirit of those bold mountaineers, who loved liberty and independence more than their lives, and expelled the foreign invader from their soil. The glory of an individual belongs to the Swiss people. The sacred oath of the men of Grütli on the Lake of Lucerne, at the foot of Seelisberg (1306 or 1308?), and the more certain confederation of December 9, 1315, at Brunnen, were renewals of the previous covenant of 1291.*

The Swiss successfully vindicated their independence against the attacks of the House of Habsburg in the memorable battles of Morgarten ("the Marathon of Switzerland," 1315), Sempach (1336), and Näfels (1383); against King Louis XI. of France at St. Jacob, near Basle (the Thermopylæ of Switzerland, 1444), and against Duke Charles the Bold, of Burgundy, at Granson, Murten (Morat), and Nancy (1476 or 1479).

Nature and history made Switzerland a federative republic. This republic was originally a loose, aristocratic confederacy of independent cantons, ruled by a Diet of one house, where each canton had the same number of deputies and votes; so that a majority of the Diet could defeat a majority of the people. This state of things continued till 1848, when (after the defeat of the

library of Zurich. It is carefully described, with a facsimile, in the *Neujahrsblatt* of the *Stadtbibliothek in Zürich auf das Jahr 1889* (Zurich, Orell Füssli & Co.).

* On the origin of the Swiss Confederation and the Tell and Grütli legends, see the critical researches of Kopp, *Urkunden zur Geschichte der eidgenössischen Bünde*, Luzern, 1835, and Wien, 1851, two vols.; Hisely, *Recherches critiques sur Guillaume Tell*, Lausanne, 1843; Kopp, *Zur Tell-sage*, Luzern, 1854-56; Karl Hagen, *Die Politik der Kaiser Rudolf von Habsburg und Albrecht I., und die Entstehung der schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft*, Bern, 1857; G. von Wyss, *Die Gesch. der drei Länder Uri, Schwyz und Unterwalden, 1212-1315*, Zurich 1858; *Zürich am Ausgange des dreizehnten Jahrh.*, Zurich, 1876; A. Rilliet, *Les origines de la Confédération suisse, histoire et légende*, second ed. Genève, 1869; Dierauer, *Gesch. des Schweiz-Eidgenossenschaft*, Gotha, 1887, vol. I., 81-151.

Sonderbund of the Roman Catholic cantons) the constitution was remodeled on democratic principles, after the American example, and the legislative power vested in two houses, one (the *Ständerath* or Senate) consisting of forty-four deputies of the twenty-two sovereign cantons (as in the old Diet), the other (the *Nationalrath* or House of Representatives) representing the people in proportion to their number (one to every 20,000 souls); while the executive power was given to a council of seven members (the *Bundesrath*), elected for three years by both branches of the Legislature. Thus the confederacy of cantons was changed into a federal State, with a central government, elected by the people and acting directly on the people.*

This difference in the constitution of the central authority must be kept in mind in order to understand why the Reformation triumphed in the most populous cantons, and yet was defeated in the Diet.† The small forest cantons had each as many votes as the much larger cantons of Zurich and Berne, and kept out Protestantism from their borders till the year 1848. The loose character of the German Diet and the absence of centralization accounts in like manner for the victory of Protestantism in Saxony, Hesse, and other States and imperial cities, notwithstanding the hostile resolutions of the majority of the Diet, which again and again demanded the execution of the Edict of Worms.

The Christianization of Switzerland began in the fourth or third century under the Roman rule, and proceeded from France or Italy. Geneva, on the border of France and Savoy,

* The *Staatenbund* became a *Bundesstaat*. The same difference exists between the American Confederacy during the Revolutionary War and the United States after the war, as also between the old German *Bund* and the new German *Empire*.

† The numerical strength of Protestantism at the death of Zwingli was probably not far from two-thirds of the population. The relation of the two confessions has undergone no material change. In 1880 Switzerland had a population of 2,846,102, of whom 1,667,109 were Protestants, 1,160,782 Roman Catholics, the rest Jews and dissenters.

is the seat of the oldest church and bishopric founded by two bishops of Vienne, in southern Gaul. The bishopric of Coire, in the southeastern extremity, appears first in the acts of a Synod of Milan, 452. The northern and interior sections were Christianized in the seventh century by the Irish missionaries, Columban and Gallus. The last founded the abbey of St. Gall, which became a famous centre of civilization for Alemania. The first, and for a long time the only, university of Switzerland was that of Basle (1460), where one of the three reformatory councils was held (1430). During the middle ages the whole country, like the rest of Europe, was subject to the Roman See, and no religion was tolerated but the Roman Catholic. It was divided into six episcopal dioceses: Geneva, Coire, Constance, Basle, Lausanne and Sion (Sitten). The Pope had several legates in Switzerland who acted as political and military agents and treated the little republic like a great power. The most influential bishop, Schinner, of Sion, who did substantial service to the warlike Julius II. and Leo X., attained even a cardinal's hat. Zwingli, who knew him well, might have acquired the same dignity if he had followed his example.

The Swiss Reformation.

The church in Switzerland was as corrupt and as much in need of reform as in Germany. The inhabitants of the old cantons around the Lake of Lucerne were, and are to this day among the most honest and pious Catholics. But the clergy were ignorant, superstitious and immoral, and set a bad example to the laity. The convents were in a state of decay, and could not furnish a single champion able to cope with the Reformers in learning and moral influence. Celibacy made concubinage a common and pardonable offense. The Bishop of Constance (Hugo von Hohenlandenberg) absolved guilty priests on the payment of a fine of four guilders for every child born to them, and is said to have derived from this source 7500 guilders in a single year (1522). In a pastoral letter written shortly before the Reformation he complained of the immoral-

ity of many priests who openly kept concubines or bad women in their houses, who refuse to dismiss them or bring them back secretly, who gamble, sit with laymen in taverns, drink to excess and utter blasphemies.*

The people were corrupted by the foreign military service (called *Reislaufen*), which perpetuated the fame of the Swiss for bravery and faithfulness, but at the expense of independence and good morals.† Kings and Popes vied with each other in tempting offers to secure Swiss soldiers, who often fought against each other on foreign battle-fields and returned with rich pensions and dissolute habits. Zwingli knew this evil from personal experience as chaplain in the Italian campaigns, attacked it before he thought of reforming the church, continued to oppose it when called to Zurich, and found his death at the hands of a foreign mercenary.

On the other hand there were some hopeful signs of progress. The reformatory councils of Constance and Basel were not yet entirely forgotten among the educated classes. The revival of letters stimulated freedom of thought and opened the eyes to abuses. The University of Basle became a centre of literary activity and illuminating influences. There Thomas Wyttenbach, of Biel, taught theology between 1505 and 1508, and attacked indulgences, the mass, and the celibacy of the priesthood; he married, in 1524, with seven other priests, and was deposed as preacher, but not excommunicated. He combined several high offices, but died in great poverty, 1526. Zwingli attended his lectures in 1502 and learned much from him. In Basle, Erasmus, the great luminary of liberal learning, spent several of the most active years of his life (1514-16 and 1521-29) and published, through the press of his friend, Frobenius,

* Mürkofer, *Ulr. Zwingli* vol. I. 67. Zwingli was reported to have said that of a thousand priests and monks scarcely one was chaste. Egli, *Actensammlung*, p. 62.

† The heroic devotion shown by Swiss troops in defence of foreign masters is immortalized by the famous Thorwaldsen statue of the wounded lion in Lucerne. John von Müller and Bluntschli represent the bright side of this foreign military service.

most of his books, including his editions of the Greek Testament. In Basle several works of Luther were reprinted to be scattered through Switzerland. Capito, Hedio, Pellican and Oecolampadius likewise studied, taught and preached in that city.

But the Reformation proceeded from Zurich, not from Basel, and was guided by Zwingli, who combined the humanistic culture of Erasmus with the ability of a popular preacher and the practical energy of an ecclesiastical reformer.

The Swiss Reformation may be divided into three acts and periods:

I. The Zwinglian Reformation in the German cantons from 1519 to Zwingli's death and the peace of Cappel, 1531.

II. The Calvinistic Reformation in French Switzerland from 1531 to the death of Calvin, 1564.

III. The labors of Bullinger in Zürich (d. 1575) and Beza in Geneva (d. 1605) for the consolidation of the work of their older friends and predecessors.

The Zwinglian movement was nearly simultaneous with the German Reformation and came to an agreement with it at Marburg in fourteen out of fifteen articles of faith; the only serious difference being the mode of Christ's presence in the eucharist. Although Zwingli died in the prime of life, he already set forth most of the characteristic features of the Reformed Churches, at least in rough outline.

But Calvin is the great theologian, organizer and disciplinarian of the Reformed Church. He brought it nearer the Lutheran Church in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but he widened the breach in the doctrine of predestination.

Zwingli and Bullinger connect the Swiss Reformation with that of Germany, Hungary and Bohemia, Calvin and Beza with that of France, Holland, England and Scotland.

The Genius of the Swiss Reformation compared with the German.

On the difference between the Lutheran and Reformed Confessions see GÖBEL, HUNDESHAGEN, SCHNEKENBURGER, etc., quoted in Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. 1. 211.

Protestantism gives larger scope to individual and national freedom and variety of development than Romanism, which demands uniformity in doctrine, discipline and worship. It has no visible centre or headship, and consists of a number of separate and independent organizations under the invisible headship of Christ. It is one flock, but in many folds. Variety in unity, and unity in variety, is the law of God in nature and history. Protestantism has fully developed the former, but not yet realized the latter.

The two original branches of evangelical Christendom are the Lutheran and the Reformed Confessions. They are as much alike, and as much distinct, as the Greek and the Roman branches of Catholicism, which rest on the national basis of philosophical Greece and political Rome. They are equally evangelical and admit of an organic union, which has actually been effected in Prussia and other parts of Germany since the third anniversary of the Reformation in 1817. Their differences are theological rather than religious; they affect the intellectual conception, but not the heart and soul of piety. The only serious doctrinal difference which divided Luther and Zwingli at Marburg was the mode of the real presence in the eucharist; as the double procession of the Holy Spirit was for centuries the only doctrinal difference between the Greek and Roman churches. But other differences of government, discipline, worship and practice developed themselves in the course of time, and overshadowed the theological lines of separation.

The Lutheran family embraces the churches which bear the name of Luther and accept the Augsburg Confession; the Reformed family (using the term Reformed in its historic and

general sense) comprehends the churches which trace their origin directly or indirectly to the labors of Zwingli and Calvin.*

In England, the second or Puritan Reformation gave birth to a number of new denominations which after the Toleration Act of 1689 were organized into distinct churches. In the eighteenth century arose the Wesleyan revival movement, which grew into one of the largest and most active churches in the English speaking world.

Thus the Reformation of the sixteenth century is the mother or grandmother of at least half-a-dozen families of evangelical denominations, not counting the subdivisions. Lutheranism has its strength in Germany and Scandinavia, the Reformed Church in Great Britain and North America.

The Reformed Confession developed different types. Traveling westward with the course of Christianity and civilization, it became more powerful in Holland, England and Scotland than in Switzerland; but the chief characteristics which distinguish it from the Lutheran confession were already developed by Zwingli and Calvin.

The Swiss and the German Reformers agreed in opposition to Romanism, but the Swiss departed further from it. The former were zealous for the sovereign glory of God, and in the spirit of the first and second commandments, abolished the heathen element of creature worship; while Luther, in the interest of free grace and the peace of conscience, aimed his strongest blows at the Jewish element of monkish legalism and

* On the Continent and in the works of church history the designation *Reformed* includes Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Congregationalists and other non-Lutheran Protestants. Calvinism and Puritanism are not church terms, but denote schools and parties within the Reformed churches. The Anglican Reformed church stands by itself as a communion which was reformed under Lutheran and Calvinistic influences, but occupies a position between Catholicism and Protestantism. In modern English and American usage the term *Reformed* has assumed a restricted sectional sense in connection with other terms, as Reformed Dutch, Reformed German, Reformed Presbyterian, Reformed Episcopalian.

self-righteousness. The Swiss theology starts from God's glory and grace to man's needs; the Lutheran from man's needs to God's grace.

Both agree in the three fundamental principles of Protestantism, the absolute supremacy of the Divine Scriptures as a rule of faith and practice, justification by free grace through faith, and the general priesthood of the laity. But as regards the first principle, the Reformed Church is more radical in carrying it out against human traditions, abolishing all which have no root in the Bible, while Luther retained those which are not contrary to the Bible. As regards justification by faith, Luther made it the article of the standing or falling church, while Zwingli and Calvin subordinated it to the ulterior truth of eternal foreordination by free grace, and laid greater stress on good works and strict discipline. Both opposed the idea of a special priesthood and hierarchical rule, but the Swiss Reformers gave larger scope to the popular lay element and set in motion the principle of congregational and synodical self-government and self-support.

Both brought the new church into close contact with the State; but the Swiss Reformers controlled the State in the spirit of Republican independence which ultimately led to a separation of the secular and spiritual power, or to a free church in a free State (as in the Free Churches of French Switzerland, Scotland, and in all the churches of the United States), while Luther and Melancthon, with their native reverence for monarchical institutions and the German empire, taught passive obedience in politics and brought the church under bondage of the civil rule.

All the evangelical divines and rulers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were inconsistently intolerant in theory and practice. But the Reformation, which was a revolt against papal tyranny and a mighty act of emancipation, led ultimately to the triumph of religious freedom, as its legitimate fruit.

The Reformed Church does not bear the name of any man and is not controlled by a towering personality, but assumed different types under the moulding influence of Zwingli and

Bullinger in Zurich, of Ecolampadius in Basle, of Haller in Berne, of Calvin and Beza in Geneva, of Ursinus and Olevianus in the Palatinate, of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley in England, of Knox in Scotland. The Lutheran church, as the very name indicates, has the stamp of Luther indelibly impressed upon it, although the milder and more liberal Melancthonian tendency has in it a legitimate place of honor and power, and manifests itself in all progressive and unionistic movements of Calixtus, of Spener, and of the moderate Lutheran schools of our age.

Calvinism has made a stronger impression on the Latin and Anglo-Saxon races than on the German; while Lutheranism is essentially German and undergoes more or less change in other countries.

Calvin aimed at a reformation of discipline as well as theology, and established a model theocracy in Geneva, which lasted two or three generations. Luther contented himself with a reformation of faith and doctrine, leaving the practical consequences to time, but bitterly lamented the antinomian disorder and abuse, which for a time threatened to neutralize his labors in Saxony.

The Swiss Reformers reduced worship to the utmost simplicity and naked spirituality, and made its effect for kindling or chilling devotion to depend upon the personal piety and intellectual effort of the minister and the merits of his sermons and prayers. Luther, who was a poet and musician, left larger scope for the esthetic and artistic elements, and his church developed a rich liturgical and hymnological literature. Congregational singing, however, flourishes in both denominations, and the Anglican church produced the best liturgy, which has kept its place to this day with increasing popularity.

The Reformed Church excels in self-discipline, liberality, energy and enterprise; it carries the gospel to all the heathen lands and new colonies; it builds a God-fearing, manly, independent, heroic type of character, such as we find among the French Huguenots, the English Puritans, the Scotch Coven-

anters, the Waldenses in Piedmont, and sent in times of persecution a noble army of martyrs to the prison and the stake. The Lutheran church cultivated a hearty, trustful, inward, mystic style of piety, the science of theology, biblical and historical research, and wrestles with the deepest problems of philosophy and religion.

God has wisely distributed His gifts with abundant opportunities for their exercise in the building up of His kingdom.

III.

THE LIGHT OF LIFE.*

BY T. T. MUNGER, D.D.

Pastor of the United Church in New Haven, Conn.

Then spake Jesus again unto them, saying, I am the light of the world : he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.—St. John viii. 12.

“THE light of life.” What does this phrase mean? Not that light is the cause of life, as the sun is the cause of life in growing things. This is true, but it is not the truth here stated. The light is for dispelling darkness, for walking, for making plain, for lighting up life so that one can see it and find one's way through it.

The phrase may contain a great deal more ; the words themselves—light and life—stand for great immeasurable facts ; *light*, almost an attribute of Deity ; *life*, the substance of God. Any use of these words takes us up to these eternal realities ; but here they are used in a restricted sense ; the light reveals the life : Christ explains the life of man.

The mystery of human life,—where it comes from, what becomes of it, how it is to be lived, how it is to be extricated from its perplexities and contradictions, how it is related to time, the total why and wherefore of it,—this is the constant theme of inquiry with philosophers and poets and all who think. The minor questions we answer well enough ;—why fire burns ; why the heart beats and the mind remembers ;—but the greater question, *why* we have nerves and heart and mind ; *why* and

* A Discourse delivered at the Sixty-fourth Anniversary of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa., on the evening of May 8th, 1889.

how we are these?—to this there is no answer. Everything about us is getting to be well explained, but self itself, existence, life,—this is the riddle we are always asking, but never answering. I know well enough why I should do this and that, but *why I am*? I do not know.

I say, this is the constant inquiry, the ever-haunting perplexity of human existence. But Christ not only does not seem to have felt it in Himself, but He declares Himself to be the answer and explanation of it: "I am the *light* of the world." I am the *explanation* of the world. Understand *me* and you will understand the world and life and yourself. And what is more, you will understand how to walk your way through life. It follows that Christ must have had a very thorough conception of life. He bounded it by the lines of His own being. He had measured and compassed it; He had pierced to its meaning, and discovered its laws, and settled upon the principles under which it was to be lived. By exactly what process He came to such knowledge, it is not necessary to ask: whether by intuitive glance that took in all things; or as the result of His perfection, for a perfect being generates perfect knowledge; or by a process of observation and comparison. It is possible that all conspired to produce the result; that by intuition He *saw* things as they are; that as He lived on perfectly from day to day He found Himself gaining absolute convictions; that as He brooded on existence and watched His fellow-men, He came to understand life and their lives. All these ways were possible to the Divine man. Of one thing, however, we may be sure, He did not blindly accept life, nor did He simply better the Jewish conception of life, nor did He confine Himself to a view of His own life. He detached Himself from the existing world and surveyed life afresh, apart and with universal vision.

In one of Plato's Dialogues—the Phædrus—the gods are represented as sometimes leaving their work in the interior of heaven, and mounting the top of the dome of heaven for feast and festival, where the revolution of the worlds brings into

their view justice, temperance and knowledge—not as realities in the life of men, but in their absolute essence; and the beholding of these virtues is their feast and festival. The genius of Plato never rose to a higher flight than in these pages, and no other man ever rose higher, but in Christ we have that view of life as from “the dome of heaven,” but it was not directed to spiritual essences, but to actual life in a real world; He did not feast upon absolute knowledge, but He lived and died in the actual struggle of the world in order to bear witness to the truth.

This entire consciousness and comprehension of life in Christ is something well worth looking at; it is what the world is now searching for, a satisfactory theory of life. Science has scaled “the flaming walls of the world,” and the Universe lies under our eye. What is our relation to it? is the question that now haunts the human mind. Still, the brute-like indifference to life lingers, and most men are only half conscious of themselves. They *accept* life; they do not get outside of themselves and look at life as external, and measure it, and then return to it with some knowledge of it.

Christ had this sense of life in perfection—a full, clear, intense conception of it as something to be lived out under certain principles and in a certain way. He Himself lived in that way and under those principles; and so living He was the light of the world.

Let us now see what some of these leading principles were, rapidly passing them in review.

1. *He lived His life under a sense of God as the Father.*

All other names of God are passed by. He does not care to speak of God as *Existence* or as *Power*. He does not, as modern thought and rhetoric are prone to do, refer to God under adjectives or by use of attributes. All this He takes for granted, and passes on to a name which summed up his conception of the Divine Being. It has for us not only the force of a definition, but it prescribes the way in which we are to think of God, and shuts off any conflicting conception of Him. I mean

that if we think of God in any other way than as the *Father*, we find ourselves in confusion and on wrong paths. Christ virtually said: "Think of God as the Father and you will think truly and logically. Interpret the world as made by the Father, and you will understand the world. Look at life as under the Father, and life will have meaning. Look at yourselves as the children of the Father, and you will understand yourselves."

It is upon the interpretation of this phrase, "*Our Father, which art in heaven*," that modern thought in theology is turning; a crucial phrase where schools of thought divide. Does it mean that God, having been something else, *becomes* a Father to those who consciously become His sons, so that he is a Father only to believers and confessors, and is something quite different to those who do not believe, a sovereign or a consuming fire? Or, is it a universal phrase, a revelation of God, a new and complete uncovering of His nature? Is it a conception of God which Christ brought out of eternity and disclosed to the world, came into the world in order to disclose it so that the world might know not merely the particular relation of men to God, but *what sort of a being God is*? Theology divides in its answers to this question,—one school regarding the phrase as conveying only a tender and lofty sentiment; another as referring to a relation to the chosen few who believe; another as a revelation so great and essential that it required the Incarnation in order that it might be made: the Son of God and the Son of man imply God the Father. The thought of the day is moving in the latter direction. As it takes in the great name, it is able to give some clearer answer to the perplexing questions cast upon the human mind by the growing consciousness of man.

What is needed in order to understand the world and human life is a knowledge of their Author or Source. If the world and life have no known source or author, you will know nothing of the world and life beyond some few of their processes: the ignorance strikes through and invests all the facts. If all

we know of their origin is that they spring out of Force, then life is simply a play of forces. If the Creator is known only as Power, life will have no significance except as a display of power. If God is only known as a moral Governor, we cannot know ourselves except as beings who are governed subjects. If God is unknowable, unrevealed, indifferent, life is spread over with the same darkness. Things do not have their explanation in themselves, but in their source and final intention. Origin and destiny are the interpreters of life. Hence Christ, at the outset, put the world and life under the illumination of their Source. We can have no sure knowledge of creation until we know the Creator; we cannot know ourselves, nor duty, until we know the Being who made us. Without proof or assertion Christ *assumes* that God is the Father. Even before He names Him as such, He calls peacemakers "the children of God." And then follows the *Name*—falling from His lips as naturally as we hear it from the children who cling about our knees: "Glorify your Father which is in heaven;" "That ye may be the children of the Father which is in heaven;" "Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect;" "Otherwise, ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven;" "Thy Father which seeth in secret;" "Pray ye: Our Father, which art in heaven;" "Your heavenly Father will also forgive you;" "Appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret." The Father feeds the fowls of the air. The heavenly Father knows all our needs. The Father is more ready to give good gifts to us than we are to our children. Thus our Lord names the chief relations and duties of human life, and they are all set under the conception of a Father. The duties are prescribed by a Father. The dependence is upon a Father. The example is a Father. The aim of life is to glorify a Father. It is the name of the Being, which, in Hebrew thought, describes the nature. To the Jew a name was a revelation. "Tell me thy name," is a prayer that God would disclose Himself. When the Source of all things is so named, all things

begin to grow clear. If God is the Father, men are brethren. Under this single burning ray of divine light a thousand problems are made plain. There is not a perplexing question in human society but is solved in its main features, in the light of the brotherhood of man as the correlation of the fatherhood of God. Far enough off we are from its realization, but there is the great truth, dawning like a sun upon the world's horizon, touching with its first rays a few nations, gloriously illuminating a few points; but when it reaches the zenith, the problems of society will be settled. Not only will the wrongs have disappeared, but the why and wherefore of the constitution and order of society will be understood. The Son of the Father is the Light of the world.

In the same way, individual life is cleared up and explained to itself. If there is one clear, undoubtable, self-explaining thing in the world it is the *family*. When a father takes his child in his arms and lets his heart flow out upon it, there is no doubt or question as to the reality or value of the relation. Love is its own argument and vindication. He may give and withhold, reward and punish, but the fatherly heart is the source of all. Now when we put our individual lives into the same relation—God the Father of us—there is the same vindication. If I can so name God, I can understand my life, just because I understand how a father deals with children. I know why He withholds and chastens and scourges; it is the paternal way.

My point is, that God as the Father throws light upon life and settles its questions. And no questions are so thoroughly settled by it as questions in *theology*. There ought to be no questions in theology. We have a *revelation*, not a perplexity; a Sun, not shadows. If men had accepted God as Christ revealed Him—a Father—that tangled wilderness known as the history of doctrine, would have had no existence. The fact was too simple for conceited man to be content with. There was no place for it in the institutions of a selfish world—a world in which the family was hardly known—and so it was thrown into

the shadow of what men *did* know—imperial and legal conceptions as far away from Christ's idea as Rome was from Nazareth and Calvary. Hence question upon question, fretting tender souls, saddening and burdening the Church, prolific source of unbelief, rending the seamless robe of Christ into the tatters it now is—a dreary history that will end only when men forsake their traditions and sit down at Christ's feet and humbly strive to understand Him when He says: "Our Father who art in heaven," and take Him at His word. Is it a vain hope? Alas! men are so ready to listen to any teacher but Him who is the Light of the World.

We might almost stop here, feeling that in the light of this great Name the whole world is lighted. But Christ went on after uttering it, and lived His life, making it a commentary, as it were, upon the word He had spoken.

2. Another fact which Christ laid at the foundation of His life by which He became the Light of the world was *obedience to the laws*.

We first find Him in this attitude. "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" He had already learned the *name*, and along with it came a sense of obedience. The Father had put Him into the relation of the family, and so He was subject to its law. As His vision widened and He saw that the Father was over all, He found everywhere the *will* of the Father. Thus His life turned into a perpetual act of obedience. *To do the will*; that was His meat and drink. By doing the will, He knew the doctrine. It marked out His course, and as it led Him along paths of rejection and far away from men, He kept steadily on till the question arose whether He should obey and die or disobey and live; but no question for Him to falter over. "Lo! I come to do thy will," and He dies in the sacrifice of obedience.

Now this was not a mere sentiment with Christ, nor a rapturous outcome of His intense and supreme sense of God as the Father; it was also a conviction, a conclusion of wisdom, a

perception of a universal truth. He saw that there was no safety, no right way to act in this world but to put Himself in harmony with the laws of God. They were all about Him, over Him and under Him and in Him; they were of all sorts, natural, physical, social, moral, spiritual. Everywhere and in all things and relations, He found the divine will—*law*, and there was one first and last thing for Him to do—namely to *obey it*. That was safe; that was right; that would take Him into the true order of the world; that would make His life consistent and harmonious with itself and all else. That would put Him on good and proper terms with God and men and nature. He saw that there was only one path through the darkness and mystery of the world; that if He would come out anywhere, He must walk that path. Otherwise He would stand still or wander in darkness. He saw that if any gain or use or good or joy were to be secured, they must come through obedience. All good is locked up in law, and the key is obedience. Forever and forever is this true. There is no *merit* in obeying the laws; it is perdition *not* to obey them. We *deserve* nothing by obedience, but we secure all the good that can be had in this world or any other in that way, and we can get it in no other way. The gracious redemption is not a substitute for God's laws, but only a means for bringing us back into the paths of obedience. *The atonement is a matter pertaining not to the divine sovereignty but to the divine paternity*. We forgive a child, but only in order to reinstate it in obedience; and God forgives us, and blots out and forgets all our past sins, only that we may re-enter the way of obedience and there work out our salvation. "Obey and be blest" is the one greatest, eternal truth.

Christ put this truth at the bottom of His life because it is at the bottom of every life. That made Him sinless; that led Him back to the glory He had with God; that made Him our Redeemer and the Captain of our salvation; it is *in* that and *through* that He is our example; *in* and *through* that He achieved redemption.

There is, my friends, a phrase which is often on our lips—precious and full of reality—“*nearness to Christ*.” But it means more than a soothing presence, more than a fellowship of sympathy, more than the mystical reality of mind touching mind in the realm of the spirit. In no way can we come so near to Christ, and He to us, as in the steady pursuit, or perhaps struggle, of obedience. That is what He chiefly did and thought about; there the emphasis and purpose and strife of His life fell—to *do the will* day by day and in all things, come what might.

There can be no real *nearness* to Christ except here; but when there is *nearness* of this sort, then I know not into what intimacies of spiritual communion or into what heights of spiritual vision we may not enter with Him. They that *do the will* know the doctrine—yes, know all things.

3. Another illuminating principle which Christ put under His life was an *all-governing love* for men.

It was a *human life lived*—not a life of sacred emotion in the air, or in some remote world. He brought into the life of this world the love of God. This is the wonder of Christ: He incarnated the love of God.

Two things we need to know in order to understand human life; that *God is love* and that man must love like God. Love is not an attribute of God, or a quality that runs along side of other qualities. Rather, when all attributes are joined, they form *Love*. The whole action of God is the action of Love, and because it is such it is holy and just. It is in the *love* that you find the justice and holiness. It does not matter what flames of wrath and fiery indignation issue from His throne, nor what lightnings and tempests play upon the world. These also are forms of love; for there is nothing so awful as pure and absolute Love; it is a consuming fire. Love is inexorable; it will have its way. In one sense it knows no pity. It will itself die to gain its end: it will scourge and punish and torment men until they come under its blessed law. Christ incarnated this love; He is God's own love in the world. He

lives God's love in actual life, lodges and fixes it as a way of feeling and acting for all men. There is no other true way of living. *God's* life must be *man's* life. The creature must have the same rule of action as the Creator. The heart of the Universe and the heart of man must beat in unison. As Christ looked out upon the world and into Heaven He saw this one thing, *eternal and absolute Love*. It made the heavens and the earth and man. All things were framed and joined together by this love. Hence man must love, and so only can he come into the harmony of God. Christ put this law of love at the basis of life. Love God supremely and your neighbor as yourself.

When men do this, light begins to dawn, and the shadows flee away from life. All this talk about the darkness and unintelligibility of the world is prompted by conditions where selfishness and hatred and hard indifference of man to man prevail. It is true enough; no colors are too dark to paint the reality. But let love fall upon the scene and there begins to be light. There is no mystery, or perplexity, or sad wonder, or pondering, heavy-hearted gloom in a family where love reigns. O, what a symbol and reflection of the heaven where there is no night, is such a family! Husband and wife, parents and children, love each other and obey love's pure and binding laws—an easy yoke; the little ones and the weak confidently trust; the older and stronger minister to them with willing gladness; all serve one another; each denies himself for the other; pity, tenderness, patience, obedience flow from heart to heart and pass like golden coin from hand to hand; and as they thus live on, clinging closer when the storms of a finite world fall upon them and loving more deeply as the years pass on—there is no question as to the *meaning* of it all. Their love is their *light* as well as their law. Their full, happy life is its own explanation. It is one of the profoundest words of revelation: "There shall be no night there." Why? Not because in the spiritual heavens there may not be some shadow as of nightly darkness that falls upon heavenly beings, bring-

ing a sweeter rest and a deeper peace, and perchance also as here, revealing deeper heavens of glory, but because perfect love yields constant light. Absolute Love is absolute truth. There are no problems in heaven; love makes all things plain.

When Christ brings this love into the world, He brings also its light, and so He is the Light of the world.

These are practical as well as fundamental truths. The world just now is full of questions. Human society has become a problem. The transition from the monarchical to the democratic conception, the passing away of king and class, and the coming forward of self-sovereign man, throw upon us questions that must be answered and settled in a practical way. What a turmoil everywhere! What mighty forces are at work! What conflicts already! What greater ones to follow before this new chaos settles into order!

How long will it be before the light will break through the cloudy firmament and show us how men can live together on this planet? The immediate questions are hard to deal with. It is not easy to decide how to treat this uprising and—as it were—insurrection of humanity. It often seems premature; it is certainly often wild and irrational; the true and the false, the good and the evil seem inextricably blended. One thing, however, is clear; it is inevitable. And it is also clear that any true solution and adjustment of these questions must be in the line and under the light of this law of love which Christ placed at the basis of social life. We may be forced to do some things that are merely expedient, to accept half-way measures. We may be driven to wield the sword that Christ brought into the world; to suffer the consuming fire to burn—as it assuredly will—until the dross of original evil is burned up. We cannot lay down ideals upon a relative world; we can only keep them in view and work towards them. But we must not for one moment forget that God's love, realized in the brotherhood of man, is the light and the law of human society. The questions and the conflicts and the darkness will end only as *that* force and light enter into them.

4. There are several other underlying and illuminating principles or methods of action in Christ's life of which I cannot speak fully, and will only name, such as an unfailing pity for all suffering. It was more than a sentiment; it was a law of his life, a deliberately adopted habit of feeling in the presence of a suffering world. No matter how the suffering comes about, nor how much of it is deserved, nor how necessary it may all be,—He looked at it with the steady eye of *pity*, felt the suffering as in Himself, poured His heart out upon it, laid His omnipotent, arresting hand upon it, breathed over it His tenderest words: "Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden and I will give you rest." Pity—boundless and deep—but never forgetting the laws of deliverance:—"Take *my* yoke upon you."

Such a feeling, so used, is fundamental to all true living, and all understanding of life.

5. A hatred of all evil.

Love and pity are often regarded as antagonistic to hatred, but love *must* hate whatever is opposite to good. Divine love goes to the roots of things. That, and that only, which thwarts love is *evil*. It is the wild beast that is to be hunted and slain. It is the poisonous plant that is to be exterminated. It is the death that preys upon life, and must itself be put to death. Hence Christ turned Himself into a flame of burning hatred when He met real evil and evil men. Woe upon woe, and curse upon curse fell from His pitying lips upon the false and inhuman betrayers of humanity.

This feeling was central to His life, and it enters into every sound and genuine life. The evil of the world will never be driven out of it; evil men will never be put down, until good men—angry, but sinning not—learn to hate evil and all who do evil.

6. Entire confidence in the truth.

He planted Himself upon *truth*—the reality of things. The truth of God, true belief, true action, true thinking and feeling, honesty, sincerity, simplicity; letting yea be yea and nay, nay,

openness to the light, responsiveness to the revelations of God, and above all a *love* for truth, a passionate desire to come into harmony with eternal reality—a spiritual analogy to chemical affinity—cleaving to truth by force of eternal law; these lay at the bottom of Christ's life. He came into the world to bear witness to the truth, and died rather than deny it. The *truth* makes men free. It is the basis of character, the life-blood of society. It brings men into the harmony of God, for it is simply the reality of that which God has made and revealed.

It was this confidence in the truth that made Christ strong. If truth is simply the reality of things, he who has the truth makes the universe his ally; he can afford to stand firm, to wait, to endure; he cannot fail, nor perish. Christ cast Himself upon the truth and trusted it. But it was not abstract truth, or truth in essence, like that which the gods contemplated from "the dome of heaven," but *the truth of life*—true thinking, true feeling, true acting. By being true to life and in life, He made its forces permanent and good.

7. Christ put great confidence in the passive virtues—patience, endurance, meekness, non-resistance of evil—or what may be called the *silent* qualities of life. There is no side of Christ's conduct more evident; none harder to understand. There is, in fact, no such thing as a *passive* virtue. To endure in silence a wrong may involve intense action. The passiveness is superficial; under it there may be forces at work for which *action*, in its ordinary sense, is weakness. This is what constitutes their value. They yield self-command; they teach the soul to sit firm and undisturbed on its throne of conscious rectitude; they leave evil to tire itself out in beating the air; they make us free to rise into the world of God and join ourselves to His eternal patience and supremacy. It was in these virtues that Christ came nearest to God; and by them He was strongest. They were fundamental in His life, and so they illuminated all life.

8. A sense of life as continuous, and as leading on to an end or condition which He calls *glory*.

Nothing was more fundamental; nothing more thoroughly penetrated and overhung His thoughts than this sense of a continuous life in God and a glorious end. He did not learn these things; He *knew* them; He predicated them, as a bird's wings predicate flight, and air to uphold them. In one sense Christ did not know time; but He was indifferent to it because He was so sure of it. Life forever was as clear and sure as life to-day. He did not, He *could not* think of Himself as ceasing to exist. Life predicates life, and perfect life does not mind these shadows and semblances of death cast upon it. And it is always *more* life, mounting towards some end it calls *glory*. What *glory* means, we may not be able clearly to state; we only know that perfection must lead to blessedness; and that as we become perfect there must come to us *from without* a brightness, a glory like that when the sun rises upon the darkness of night.

There is a world of the spirit—so real that this world is as mist or shadow beside it. The successive forms of creation prophesy it—the last of successive stages; it is the complement of human existence. Blind your eyes to it; turn the earthward side of yourself upon it; hurl your spears of denial against it; doubt it with hard questions of How? and Where? So might any form of lower life doubt or deny that which is higher. So might the inorganic doubt the organic, matter doubt life, the brute doubt man. But at last the organic *comes*; life at last *begins*; man at last *stands forth* amidst the brutes. Is this the end? Is there not as much beyond as behind? Does creation end with man, and even while this embryo of spirit is sleeping or stirring within him? These were not even questions to Christ. He rested solidly upon the reality of a spiritual and eternal world. It colored all His thoughts and was the confirming reason of all He did; by virtue of it, He was the light of the world.

It is not a strange but a natural coincidence that this great name and office which Christ takes for His own, is the same as that which learning, especially in its higher forms, has chosen

for itself. There is a sense in which Christ is the light of the world that does not belong to the university of learning. He is the absolute light, the sun itself; the schools of men can only reflect the light that comes to them from various sources. Still, the function of each is to illuminate. Christianity is more than deliverance from the negation and loss of sin; it is "the light of life." It lights up the world so that men can see the paths that lead to full life, and behold that truth which makes men free. It uncovers time and eternity, the world and heaven, God and man, and sets them in all the power and imperativeness of their meaning and appeal before the minds of men.

The university is more than a shop for sharpening men's wits and providing them with a certain amount of valuable information. It is a light shining upon the world. It takes all knowledge, sets it in order, extracts its meaning and gives it forth as light. It tells us what history means; it interprets the voices of nature; it traces the play of the human mind in literature; it puts the thought of antiquity beside the thought of to-day; it teaches the mind to detect and comprehend all this, and so, as its grand result, it gives forth light by which men find the better paths of the world.

It is one of the questions of the day how to combine the great universal light of Christ with the light of human learning so that they shall shine with mingled rays upon the path of human life. The day is past when it is said to Christianity and Learning: "Go your separate ways and keep to your own fields." The day of formal union is indeed past, but because the union is no longer formal is it real and vital: Your college and seminary—a happy conjunction—do not stand, as it might seem, for an ecclesiasticism, but for essential Christianity. While our universities are to be less and less identified with any particular church or visible order, they will become more and more tributary to Christian truth, for one truth cannot but help other truths, and it is impossible but that all truths shall at last flow together and form one common stream.

As Learning goes on its way, interpreting the world and his-

tory, and unveiling the nature of man, it will be found that it is casting the same light upon the path of life as that shed upon it by Christ Himself. One indeed streams from heaven and the other is reflected from the world, but they are of one nature, and proceed from Him who is over all and in all.

We may depend upon the university to deepen and clarify the intellectual conception of God as the Father. It is also deepening and enlarging our sense of the value of obedience to all law.

It is bearing its part in enforcing *humanity* as the secret of society, and is doing more than all other forces combined in finding the narrow path between love for man and the requirements of a practical world.

It is getting more and more to own no allegiance, except to the truth. The methods of study, the inductive logic, the patience of investigation, the growing disdain of foreign influences, the passion for truth itself and for naught else—these qualities are gaining ground in our universities, and as they grow they shed more light upon life.

The university, in its closer study of human nature and philosophy, is finding a power in ethics and in the spiritual virtues which have had but small place in this rough and warring world.

It is also making belief in eternal life more and more imperative by thinning the walls of the natural world and showing that the only reality is spirit. And especially is it confirming faith in immortality by showing the ever-increasing purpose which runs through all the ages, from lower to higher, from coarser to finer, from single to complex, from life to more life, from matter to mind and from mind to spirit—a climbing, mounting process from which, by its very nature, man cannot be left out when its conclusion is reached.

Here, then, is the justification, the strength of the scholar—that, whatever his field of investigation, he is, in his own humble sphere, a light-bearer, a true son of the morning, whose torch adds another ray to that Sun which is the light of the world.

IV.

A CHAPTER FROM THE LIFE OF DR. NEVIN.

BY REV. THEODORE APPEL, D.D.

BY request we here furnish the readers of this Review with a chapter from a forthcoming volume entitled "The Life and Work of the Rev. John Williamson Nevin, D.D., LL.D.," which for some time past we have been preparing for the press, under the direction of the Alumni of Franklin and Marshall College. The portion here given, somewhat abridged, embraces the period of about one year of Dr. Nevin's activity at Mercersburg. It is expected that the work as a whole, an octavo of about seven hundred pages, will make its appearance in September or October next.

As we have already said, Dr. Nevin was called to fill the vacant chair in the Seminary at Mercersburg by the Synod of the Reformed Church, assembled at Chambersburg, Pa., on the 30th of January, 1840. Under the firm conviction that it was a call from God to leave the Church of his fathers and labor in a field, which was to him in many respects a strange country, like Abraham of old he did not hesitate to obey what he conceived to be the divine will. Accordingly, on the 5th of March following, he accepted of the appointment tendered him by the Synod, in a communication addressed to the President of the Synod, the Rev. B. S. Schneck, which fully meant all that it expressed. It gave the Church the first glimpse of the man, and revealed the spirit with which he expected to come over and labor among his German brethren. Its style was vigorous and manly; and it was not only read with interest, but no doubt carefully studied by many. It was an important document at

the time, suggestive as well as expressive, and we here present it to the reader, word for word :

"I am prepared now to say that I accept of the call put into my hands by the Rev. Mr. Fisher and yourself, by which I have been invited on the part of the Synod of the German Reformed Church to the professorship of theology in the Seminary at Mercersburg. This notice is communicated to you as the President of the Synod for the present year. It is my intention to apply to the Presbytery to which I belong, at its regular meeting in April, for an honorable dismissal, with the view of passing over into the German Reformed Church. I shall be ready afterwards, with divine permission, to enter on my new office about the beginning of June.

"Allow me, through you, to express to the Synod my high sense of the honor they have conferred on me in thus electing me, with one heart and one voice, to a station so important and responsible. My inmost prayer is, that I may not be found in the end unworthy altogether of such confidence.

"At the same time I must say that I have found great difficulty in making up my mind to accept of the appointment. The question has seemed to involve the main crisis of my ministry at least, if not of my life. I have found much around me and within me to resist the call. Other ties, ecclesiastical and social, have pleaded against it strongly in my spirit. The greatness of the trust, and the difficulties that must be connected with it, have alarmed me. The idea of passing into new and untried relations, the fear of disappointing just expectations, vague apprehensions of collisions in the midst of the new order of things, the new moral system, with which I must find myself surrounded on entering into the German communion, have all contributed to invest the step with a painfully solemn interest to my feelings, and to hold my thoughts in anxious suspense with regard to listening to such a call.

"But the difficulties have been made, in the end, to yield to the persuasion that I am called of God to go to Mercersburg. The indications of His will in the case have seemed to be too

clear and striking, to be misinterpreted or disregarded. In view of all the circumstances, therefore, I have felt that it is my duty to obey the voice of your Synod. I *dare* not, for the sake of my own peace, turn away my ears from the application. The field is immensely important, and at the same time full of promise. The necessity is great. The time is critical. The call has been strange and unexpected, not only without my seeking, but *against* my own judgment and wish explicitly expressed and understood. It is the unanimous and hearty call, as it would seem, of the whole Church.

"My own training might appear to have been providentially ordered by Him who leadeth the blind in a way not understood by themselves, with special reference to this very destination. Though not a German by birth, I feel a sort of kindred interest in that people which could hardly be stronger were I one of themselves. My childhood and early youth were spent in close familiar communion with German manners and modes of thought. I understand the people well. In later life, my attention has been turned to their language and literature. These have awakened in me a new interest in their favor, and brought me into more extensive fellowship with the peculiarities of the national mind. All this enters as an element into the constitution of the call, by which I find myself bound to go into your Church. The whole case is strengthened by the fact that others, whose judgment I ought to respect, so generally admit the weight of the considerations by which I am urged to this step. Even those who seemed most desirous that I should stay where I am, would shrink, I imagine, from the responsibility of exercising a *veto* in the case, if it were altogether in their hands; and it is my confident hope that the step I am about to take, in quitting my church for yours, will commend itself to others as well as myself in such a way that all will consider it right in the end.

"Thus do I find myself constrained to go into the German Reformed Church. Let it not be thought, however, that I go reluctantly or coldly into her communion, now that the point

of duty is settled. I go indeed with fear and trembling; but I carry along with me my entire will, I give myself wholly to the German Reformed Church, and find no difficulty in making her interests my own. No church can boast of a better creed or a better ecclesiastical frame-work. Her fathers rank high in the history of the Reformation. The spirit of a time-hallowed faith, such as could once make martyrs, older than the Presbyterianism of Scotland, is still enshrined in her articles and forms, and the German Church in this country has become a rising interest. No section of our American Zion is more important. None embraces vaster resources of power in proportion to its limits. None exhibits a richer intellectual ore, available in the same way for the purpose of religion. I find no lack of considerations here to interest my sympathies or to stimulate my zeal. I can go heartily into such a church, and in this spirit I now accept of the call of your Synod to the Professorship at Mercersburg."

All this was straightforward language, which addressed to a German audience was easily understood. It showed that the man was in deep earnest about the matter; that he came to labor for the Reformed Church in all its interests no less than in the professor's chair; and that his zeal and enthusiasm were already deeply interested. Just such a person was needed at the time in the peculiar circumstances of the German Church in this country, a steady helmsman, who could speak out, and was willing to do his part in guiding the vessel through storms as well as sunshine. But here there was as yet only a promise. Would it be fulfilled? That was left for the future to decide. Our plain German people believed that Mr. Nevin, as he was called, intended to do what he said. Hard-working pastors instinctively felt that a tower of strength had risen up among them against which they could lean for support. Here were brave words for them, that came from the heart and went to the heart. With such a beginning mutual confidence was sure to grow out of the new relation which was about to be established.

Hitherto the antagonism between the English and German portions of the Church had been of such a character as to prevent them, in a great degree, from heartily uniting in the support of the Seminary or any other general interest. It now remained to be seen what influence Dr. Nevin, a new man, would exert in healing up an old sore—a root of much bitterness. There was much about him at first to create prejudice. He was “*Waelsch*,” as the Germans said, and worse than that he had come from the Irish, between whom and the Germans in former days, there was not much more communication in the Middle States than there used to be between the Jews and the Samaritans. But, strange to say, it was not long before the question was satisfactorily answered. The foreigner, by his integrity, his good common sense, his kind words and religious character, in a comparatively short period of time, was the means in the hands of Providence, more so perhaps than any one else, in dissipating the antagonism referred to, and in getting both divisions, Greeks as well as Trojans, to work together like good brethren, in fulfilling their high and holy calling.

Dr. Nevin had moved, with his family, to Mercersburg early in the spring, so that he might enter upon his duties in the Seminary at the opening of the Summer Term. Here for the first time he met with Dr. Rauch, his future colleague in the Seminary, and President of Marshall College, whose guest he became until more permanent arrangements could be made for the accommodation of himself and family. It is quite natural to suppose that both were anxious, not only to become acquainted, but also to look into each other and ascertain where each one stood in the world of thought. As yet neither had reached his fortieth year, but with the lines of thought deeply marked on their brows they seemed to be much older.

The one was a Scottish man, dignified, sedate, and apparently unemotional; the other was a pure German, full of animation, whose enthusiasm, emotions and thoughts were wont to manifest themselves externally in his countenance. How could two such men, so differently constituted, be able to get

along in the same institution of learning? It was not long before this question answered itself. They were both wise men, spiritually-minded, who looked at the substance of things, lived in the region of ideas, and were earnestly concerned that thought or truth should rule in the world practically. They had come from different races, but they possessed the same Teutonic blood in their constitutions. The Scotchman and the German exhibit marked points of divergence externally, but upon a deeper acquaintance, they soon begin to feel that they have the same common life—that they are cousin-germans. Thus it was with Dr. Nevin and Dr. Rauch. The former gives his first impressions of the latter in less than a year afterwards, when he was called to mourn over his early death, in his beautiful Eulogium of his Life and Character.

"It is now just one year," he sadly says, "since I had the privilege of becoming acquainted with Dr. Rauch personally. I had some knowledge of his general standing previously, but no particular information with regard to his character and spirit. Intimately associated as I was to be with him in professional life, I had of course felt some anxiety in relation to this point; a feeling which seemed to have so much the more reason, as it was understood that serious difficulties had already actually occurred in the official connections of Dr. Rauch, in the case of which a large share of the blame was supposed by many to rest properly on his shoulders. All anxiety of this sort, however, fled from my spirit, in a very short time, when I came to know the man himself. I found myself attracted to him from the very first. His countenance was the index of his heart, open, generous and pure. I soon felt that my relations with him were likely to be both pleasant and safe. Farther acquaintance only served to strengthen this first impression.

"It was clear to me that he had been misunderstood and wronged. He was one of the last men probably to be capable of disingenuous cunning or dishonorable dealing in any way. Then I perceived very soon also, that his learning and intellectual strength were of a higher order altogether than I had

felt myself authorized to expect; although it was not until the appearance of his 'Psychology' that I learned to place him sufficiently high in this respect. Here again it became clear to me that the proper worth of the man had not been understood; and I could not but look on it as a strange but interesting phenomenon, that here at the head of this infant College—without care or calculation or consciousness, even on the part of its friends generally—one of the finest minds of Germany should have been settled, which under other circumstances might have well been counted an ornament to the oldest or most conspicuous institution in the land. This seemed to show indeed a special favor on the part of Heaven towards the whole interest, which this enterprise may be considered to involve. No selection could have secured probably a fitter man for the station he was called to occupy, taking all the circumstances and connections into view. My own calculations, at least, with regard to him were large and full of confidence, not only as it respected the College, but in view of the general influence he seemed likely to acquire also as a scholar and writer."

Previous to this, as we have seen, Dr. Nevin had paid considerable attention to German Literature, and had derived much edification from German authors, as he informs us, especially from the writings of Neander; but now he was confronted at home with a German scholar of ability, who could tell him all about German Theology and Philosophy, under their best and worst aspects, and knew precisely where its most distinguished authors stood. This was worth to him at that time more than a library of their best works. It helped very materially to strengthen him in his desire to avail himself of "the treasures of German learning and thought." It was the spring vacation, and the conversations between the two new acquaintances were frequent and protracted, some of which we Sophomores or Juniors overheard. Once the subject was Greek Grammar, during which Dr. Nevin was shown an edition of Kuehner's Greek Grammar, then comparatively unknown in this country. After

examining it carefully, he was so struck with its able treatment of the subject, and its philosophic spirit, that he concluded to translate it at once for the benefit of American scholars. After he had gone over portions of it, he learned that he had been anticipated, as one translation was to appear shortly in England and another in this country.

Whilst, however, Dr. Nevin was thus pleased with his new colleague, Dr. Rauch, on the other hand, was in fact delighted, his pleasure amounting to an enthusiastic surprise, and he so expressed himself to the students, as opportunities presented themselves. Judging from his German standpoint, he had met with considerable superficiality among American scholars, whose performances on public platforms at times seemed to him to have more sound than substance in them. But here before him, in a very quiet man, who was less widely known than many others who possessed less ability, he met with a truly earnest and profound thinker, one who, in his opinion, had few superiors in this country. He listened with close attention to his discourses on Sunday, reminded the students of their contents in his class-room on Monday, and as his health was not firm, he insisted that Dr. Nevin, for the future, should take his place as often as possible in the pulpit on the Lord's Day. He regarded it as a rare treat to hear his discourses himself, and wished that the students should hear them also.

He was still a German, whilst his sympathies were in full flow with our free institutions, but there was much in our American life that was to him contradictory, if not absurd, which was no doubt the case. This had often made him uncomfortable; but now he had one by his side who could give him correct ideas of American life, of its bright as well as its dark side, and of its intensely earnest, practical tendencies in favor of religion and morality. He, moreover, saw that the accession of a practical as well as profound professor to the institutions, with which he had identified his life, would inure vastly to their benefit. Soon after the first acquaintance, he made the remark to a friend, that now, with Dr. Nevin by his side, "he was able, for the first

time, to breathe freely in America."—The union of two such men in the same institution of learning augured well for the future—both for their own benefit and happiness, as well as for the prosperity of the Church and the cause of Christ generally.

On the 20th of May, at the opening of the Summer Term of the College and Seminary, Dr. Nevin was inducted into office as Professor of Didactic Theology and other branches, on which occasion he delivered his Inaugural Address, which was afterwards published and extensively read throughout the Church. It made a profound impression, both on account of the striking views which it expressed, and because it served as a mirror, clearly reflecting the image of the man who was to be a future leader in Israel. It gave general satisfaction, and revived the courage and hopes of many who in dark hours had labored and struggled to establish the school of the prophets, which was to supply the Church with a well-disciplined and well-educated ministry. Some among them had entertained doubts whether such a small denomination as the Reformed would ever come to anything, and some intelligent persons on the outside supposed that as the new professor became master of the situation, he probably, in the course of time, would pass over with the denomination into that household of faith from which he had come. The Address gave no uncertain sound, and if any expectations, of the kind referred to, had been formed, they were shattered at once as mere idle imaginations. It was full of confidence and faith, and this first voice from Mercersburg was a vigorous appeal to ministers and members alike to arise up as one man and build up the broken down walls of Zion—to stand fast in their places, and to do the work which Providence had given them to do in a distinct, historical, German Church.

After giving an emphatic expression to the dignity and significance of the Christian ministry in general, in the way of introduction, the speaker dwelt at greater length on the mission of the German Reformed Church, as it was then called, in connection with the enterprise of the Synod in establishing for its

necessities a Seminary and a College. We have room here for only a few of its moral salient thoughts.

"Viewed simply as a human, worldly arrangement, apart from its higher purposes and aspects altogether, the CHRISTIAN MINISTRY may be well considered the most important form of power that has ever been brought to bear on the human mind. What agency can be imagined more fully adapted to produce effect than the one which thus spreads itself out through the social mass, and renews itself incessantly from week to week, in the same direction and under the same general form?

"The agency of the pulpit, under this view, is of more might by far than the agency of the Senate Chamber. The pastoral office, distilling its influence like gently falling dew or rain, in just those circumstances which are best adapted to open a way for it to the secret fountains of thought and feeling, is an institution whose operation will be found in the end to go deeper and to reach further than the policy and state machinery of cabinets can ever be expected to do.

"But the importance of the sacred ministry rests on higher grounds and universally more solemn than these. Its grand object is the moral improvement of those who come under its power. Righteousness and truth in the souls of men are the vital interests to which its energies are by special consecration devoted. As such it is more than a device of the State; something more than a benevolent agency, originated by wise and good men for the spiritual benefit of the world. It is a *divine* institution, planned and sanctioned by infinite wisdom, as the best possible arrangement that could be made to carry forward the vast design of the Gospel; it carries along with it from age to age a divine supernatural force for the accomplishment of spiritual effects with reference to its design. It works with invisible power on the hearts of men, and thus takes hold on the very foundation of character. It is mighty to the pulling down of strongholds, and all other forms of power are weak as compared with this.

"Defect or corruption here involves a heavier calamity than

defect or corruption in any other department of the social system. The want of a proper judiciary would be an evil less worthy of being deprecated than the want of an adequate gospel ministry. A bad administration of the State is not so great a calamity as the absence of all proper light and power from the pulpit. The heaviest affliction that can fall upon any community in this world is comprised in the words, 'I will come unto thee quickly and remove thy candlestick out of his place.' Compared with this, burdensome taxes, disordered finances, governmental abuses in general, are entitled to small consideration. The question how the currency should be regulated is of less account by far than the question, 'How shall a proper provision be made for supplying the people with sound and wholesome instruction.'"

After discussing in this way the value and importance of the sacred ministry, the Professor went on to speak of the movement on the part of the Reformed Church which had led to the establishment of a Theological Seminary and College, whose object was to supply the American-German population with properly educated religious teachers. The necessity here was at once patent, and the idea that this might be done by proxy, through some other religious denomination, was preposterous as well as impracticable. The field was vastly important, one of the most promising kind, and Providence had given it to the Germans themselves to cultivate.

"The territory," said the speaker, "comprised in the bounds of the Reformed Church is very great, and includes a large portion of the finest soil that can be found in the United States, under the highest state of cultivation. The character of the people belonging to its connection, or falling naturally under its care, is full of encouragement. The original elements of the German mind are still retained in their moral constitution—only undefined to some extent, and cast into the American mould by the peculiar influences in this new world to which they have been subjected, under a remove of two or three generations from their ancient birth-place.

"Qualities of sterling value are imbedded in their spiritual nature, which need only to be properly developed by means of knowledge and religion, working hand in hand, to place them as a people in the very foremost rank of excellence and greatness. The German mind is constitutionally vigorous and free. Simplicity, honesty and integrity characterize it strikingly under all circumstances. It leans towards nature and truth. It is thoughtful, meditative and quiet. It abounds in sentiment and feeling.—No people are more susceptible than the Germans of all the deeper and more spiritual emotions of our nature. None have a greater aptitude naturally to be wrought upon by music and painting and poetry and all that addresses itself to the æsthetical faculty in the soul. In none is the instinct of religion more powerful, or the congeniality of the soul with all that is vast and awful in faith, with all that is profound in devotion, more readily and strongly displayed. Indeed the *faults* of the German character stand more or less in affinity with the favorable susceptibilities and tendencies which have just been mentioned. These distortions it is the business of a proper religious culture to remove or prevent.

"Who, then," the Professor goes on to ask, "ought to care for these desolations, if it be not the German population of the country themselves, found in more favorable circumstances, especially on this side of the mountains? Who may be considered by their nature and position qualified in the same way to work successfully on such a field? If the German population is to rise at all to its proper rank in a religious point of view, it must be within the frame-work of its own ecclesiastical institution, and by means mainly of its own exertions. Its interests cannot with propriety or safety be committed to others. Are the Germans willing to see their own missionary ground wrested from their hands, when it should be their ambition, as it is plainly their solemn duty, to accomplish the work themselves?

"For the German Church to renounce its German character would be treason to the German interest in this country gen-

erally. Our brethren of the Lutheran and Moravian Churches might justly complain of us in such a case, that they were left to bear alone the heat and burden of the day, which belongs by divine appointment equally to us all. They have no right to desert us. We have no right to desert them. The united weight of all, standing fast to their national standards, will all be needed to make a right moral impression on the widespread community to which they belong, and to withstand successfully the force of those various forms of infidelity and error to which it is coming more and more to be exposed.

"The case is clear. The German Church must rise within herself, and under God, by and from herself. She must adhere to her own standards. She must have her own ministry; and in order to do this, her own institutions of learning must bring her own sons forward to the sacred office. As Germans the best service they can have it in their power ordinarily to render to the cause of religion in this country, will be to abide in their own Church, and to do all that in them lies to assist it in putting on the full strength of the Lord. And we may add, that we have a right to expect confidently the sympathy and friendly co-operation of brethren in other churches in this work.

"If there ever was a case in which a people were bound to rally round a common cause, as with the spirit of one man, it seems that we have it here. Who that has the heart of a German within him can refuse to lend it to a work which looks so directly to the moral elevation of a community, so great, so powerful, so full of promise, and to which he feels himself bound by so many ties. Can we conceive of an event, within the same range of possibilities, that would be so auspicious to the interests of truth, of freedom and human happiness in this country, as the general triumph of light and truth through the mighty mass of mind, between the Atlantic and the Alleghanies only, rousing it to action worthy of itself, and clothing it with the full strength of its constitution fully developed? Would it not be to the whole land as life from the dead? The dawn

of such a day, as we have imagined, might seem already to have broken above the horizon. The German mind has begun to awake from its slumber, and may be expected soon to make itself felt in a new and extraordinary way. The Church is struggling to rise, with a resolution and energy which bid fair to increase every year. But there must be action here as well as prayer. Our Institutions are not complete. They need to be extended and made strong. All this should be done without delay. The case calls for the most prompt and vigorous measures."

With these and many other words of like character the Professor exhorted the brethren to stand firm and steadfast in their high and holy calling. The Address, of which we have here given only some of the prominent thoughts, was a remarkable one, whether we consider its judicious and conservative tendency, or the character of the speaker, a Scotch-Irishman, addressing an immense German audience, including many more that were absent than those present on the occasion. It had the force of an historical event. Its contents, passing through the minds of ministers and more intelligent elders, gradually trickled down into the minds of the people. Such as were English in speech said: "Dr. Nevin means what he says." The German standing by and listening, without understanding many of the words and sentences of the Address, but readily catching its thrift and spirit quickly added: *Der Mann ist im Ernst.*

In less than a year from the delivery of this Address, the entire Church in a united capacity from the Delaware to the Susquehanna, and out even over the Alleghany Mountains into Ohio, was aglow with zeal and activity, as we shall see, in building up its schools of learning, in the support of missions, of education and its periodicals. The bickerings and jealousies of the past were, in a great measure, forgotten, and for once the German and English portions were brought together in peace and harmony. The happy settlement of the new professor at Mercersburg, with his brave and honest words, had

much to do in giving the Church an impulse such as it perhaps had never before received in this country, illustrating what has already been said that the Germans have "qualities of sterling value, imbedded in their spiritual nature, which need only to be developed by knowledge and religion." It now became evident that a minister can pass from one denomination to another, if Providence calls him to make the change, and identify himself with it in all its interests and life. There are those who make such transitions, carry with them their own subjective views and feelings, and, without any sense of incongruity continue to work on exactly in the same line as they did before, as if their object was to carry their people into the denomination from which they came. That was not the idea of one honest Scotchman, who, if he was not a descendant of the Scottish hero, William Wallace, ought to have been. He did what he had promised to do, identified himself fully with the German Church, took her for "better or worse," or, as he said in his letter to the Synod: "I give myself wholly to the German Reformed Church and find no difficulty in making her interests my own." In all this we behold integrity, which in this case was combined with a broad, comprehensive mind and a solemn sense of responsibility.

During the summer term of 1840 Dr. Nevin was frequently called on to conduct the religious services on Sunday in the college chapel. As already said, Dr. Rauch thought that the institutions were very happy in being supplied in this way with discourses so eminently calculated to edify the students. They presented a marked contrast with the usual pulpit efforts of the day, in style; in their long processes of logical reasoning, and in being twice the usual length of sermons, sufficiently dry when heard for the first time to induce drowsiness, especially on a warm summer afternoon. They were off-hand, of course, with only an occasional flash of the imagination, with no effort at rhetorical display, pungent and earnest in their appeals to the conscience as well as to the intellect. The speaker had a marked physique, a scholarly appearance, a strong, masculine

voice, such as is seldom heard in a pulpit, and presented the elements of an original character, all of which arrested the attention of the collegian no less than the theologian. The former made it a point to let it be known that he understood the sermons, in which he was probably successful with the help of the latter, after he had become somewhat accustomed to the preacher's style and language.

One of these Sunday discourses, apparently as intellectually dry as the rest, nevertheless arrested the attention of the hearers, and became the subject of remark afterwards as replete with rich and striking thought. The theme was "Party Spirit," and on further inquiry it was ascertained that the sermon embodied the substance of an address delivered before the Literary Societies of Washington College, Washington, Pa.; and as it had been published only in some magazine, a desire was expressed that a copy of it might be secured for publication in pamphlet form, which was accordingly granted under the circumstances. Then all could see it, and many successive generations of other students also saw and studied its contents. It differed somewhat from the addresses usually delivered at college commencements, but if compared with those of Webster, Wirt or Southard, it would not suffer by the comparison. It was sufficiently literary, but it was intensely practical, truly philosophical and learned. It may be said to be a cross between a sermon and a literary address, in which every now and then the different propositions are supported by appropriate quotations from Scripture, which, as they were to the point, did not detract either from the merit or strength of the effort. It was a photograph of the author at this particular period of his history, and a forecast of his subsequent attacks upon sectism and division in the Church. Space only prevents us from giving the reader in this place even a few of its plain-spoken, vigorous thoughts.

Just about the time that Dr. Nevin came to Mercersburg, Dr. Rauch's *Psychology* made its appearance, which, as a matter of course, he read, or rather studied attentively, and not without

a degree of pleasant surprise. It was favorably noticed by the *Princeton Review* and other literary organs of the day, and was soon afterwards introduced as a text-book in several institutions of the day of a high grade. A very able but eccentric critic of Boston, Dr. Orestes Brownson, comparing it with some other works of the same kind, pronounced it very decidedly to be "a work of genius." Dr. Nevin, after he was through with his Inaugural, gave it a cautious but rather exhaustive review in the *Weekly Messenger*. Subsequently he studied it still more profoundly, using it for many years as a text-book in college; and it is entirely safe for us here to say that all along it excited a potent influence in giving form to his subsequent philosophic thinking and doctrines. It was to him a starting-point, and more or less a standpoint, from which, together with Rauch's "Christian Ethics," a new world of thought grew forth and expanded in his mind, which if occasioned by contact with the mind of Rauch, became peculiarly his own. All the circumstances connected with the appearance of the book, no less than its spirit, purpose and style, were calculated to commend it to his attention, and to give his thoughts a wholesome direction.

Probably under the impression that the German churches, like most others, needed a higher degree of spirituality, he commenced a series of articles in the *Messenger* on the subject of "Worldly-mindedness," which were continued in six numbers from June to August. They were quite as long as they were thorough, but they were extensively read notwithstanding the hot weather. They were written in the style of his Puritan training, solemnly earnest, abounding in refined distinctions and valuable hints against self-deception, quite abreast with Doddridge, Edwards and other casuistical writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, who in their efforts to make religion a simple, plain matter, sometimes make it the more obscure to ordinary readers. Respect for the Sabbath was carried to its highest tension, and the reader at times is at a loss to know what works of necessity are to be allowed on that day. But the articles show an advance on the old style of writing, better

adapted to the present age, exhibiting a better knowledge of the nature of man and abounding in striking thoughts, which distinguish clearly between the carnal and spiritual man of the Scriptures. The world is presented in its proper antithesis to the kingdom of God, faith to light, and the higher spiritual nature of man to his lower animal or psychic being.

But it was not long before Dr. Nevin discovered that his pen was needed to give assistance in carrying forward the more immediate practical operations of the Church, especially in giving a new impulse to its schools of learning. These were important as well as casuistry, and for the time being more urgent. The Classis of Maryland, at its meeting in the spring, when Dr. Nevin was received as a member, had proposed that the Church as a whole should celebrate the centennial of its founding in this country during the year 1841. It met with a favorable response, and such men as Dr. Willers, of New York State, and Dr. Wolff, of Easton, Pa., urged the matter in the columns of the weekly paper of the Church. Dr. Nevin saw in it the germ of a movement which, if properly cherished, might be made to redound in an eminent degree to the growth and edification of the Church, as well as help to promote many of its most vital interests. Accordingly, after he had finished the articles on Worldly-mindedness, he began to write on the subject of the proposed Centenary in the *Messenger*. In these essays, without any restriction with regard to length, he showed how and in what spirit it should be conducted, explained its benefits, and proposed in conclusion that in connection with it the Church should make a thank-offering of \$100,000, half of which should go to Marshall College, one-fourth to the Seminary, and the other fourth to beneficiary education or other useful objects. Thus, with others, he excited in advance some degree of enthusiasm for the proposition of the Maryland Classis, so that by the time the Synod was to meet in October and take it into consideration, the subject had been pretty well ventilated, and the delegates when they came together knew how to vote.

By the close of the Summer Term in September, the new

professor had become tolerably well acquainted with the English portion of the Church in Maryland, Virginia and Central Pennsylvania, which were regarded as the more progressive and intelligent. But he had seen little or nothing of the Church lying between the Delaware and the Susquehanna, which at that time was predominantly German, and by far the strongest in membership. Some, who could not understand its language, regarded it as a region not far removed from Cimmerian darkness. None of the ministers from that section of the State had attended the meeting of the Synod at Chambersburg, on account of the distance and wintry weather, and the people had heard of the new professor only from vague rumors. It was therefore thought desirable that, during the vacation, he should visit Eastern Pennsylvania, and place himself in a position to see it for himself. The Rev. Jacob Mayer had frequently gone over the ground, as agent of the College or Seminary, and he offered to take him along with him on one of his trips. Traveling in a private conveyance from Chambersburg to Harrisburg, and thence through Reading to Easton on the Delaware, with one who was familiar with the ground, he had a better opportunity to see the country and people than in any other way. John Adams and Martin Van Buren had once passed through it, whilst they were in the Presidential chair, and both were surprised to see, not only its highly-cultivated farms, its barns and its cattle, but also its school-houses and churches.

Before the party started out on their trip, it was suggested that as Dr. Nevin might be asked to preach in the German language during his tour, he should be prepared to say something at least in that tongue. He accordingly prepared a German sermon for such an emergency, and carried the manuscript with him. The Rev. Thomas H. Leinbach, glad to see him, wished him to preach for his people, in the old Tulpehooken Church, in Berks County, and he complied with his request. Everybody seemed to be pleased. The people felt themselves complimented by a discourse delivered in their own language,

by one who had gone to the trouble of mastering it by his own private study. Nobody smiled at any mistakes of pronunciation, because the hearers were in the house of the Lord. The German clergymen present may have done so over their pipes, when they came together the next time. The report of this sermon had a happy effect among many who heard of it in all that section of country. This was treating them very differently from the style in which they were spoken of at the time by some thoughtless people. It presumed that they possessed ordinary intelligence at least. It was, however, an effort which the Doctor did not afterwards attempt to repeat.

Speaking of the country and its inhabitants, in a letter published in the weekly *Messenger*, soon afterwards, he said: "A large part of the country was new to me. It is surely one of the finest in the world. Where shall we find a country of the same extent that offers a greater show of loveliness and strength, externally considered, than that which spreads out to the eye of the traveler as he passes from Harrisburg to Reading, and afterwards through the counties of Lehigh and Northampton, till he reaches the banks of the Delaware."

"The sight of so many fine churches," he goes on to say, "scattered over this whole section of country, is highly interesting and animating. These alone are an evidence that the people to whom they belong are favorably disposed to religion. Under proper direction, the same spirit that prompts them to bestow so much attention on their places of worship may be easily brought to act with corresponding liberality and zeal in support of other interests of a religious kind.

"There are many things to be lamented in the state of our churches in East Pennsylvania, but it is my full persuasion that this section of our German Church has been greatly wronged by judgments taken from a wrong point of observation on the part of those who have not been willing to make themselves fully acquainted with its modes of thinking. The day for such *prejudices*, it is to be hoped, will soon pass away."—They have been gradually passing away ever since, and it is now only

occasionally that their faint reverberations are heard in the distance. The Pennsylvania German people and their churches now command a higher degree of respect than they ever did.

The favorable opinion of the Pennsylvania Germans, thus expressed, was justified by the interest manifested among them subsequently in the institutions at Mercersburg, and their willingness everywhere to unite in celebrating the centennial of the existence of their Church in this country. At that time the subject had been discussed in the papers, as we have seen, and it had begun to be circulated through the churches that it was proposed that they should unite in making a thank-offering of \$100,000 during the year for religious purposes, including the College and the Seminary. That was a large sum of money, enough, in those days, to stagger most people in the towns as well as in the rural districts. Such a proposition, twenty or thirty years previous to this time, would have been regarded as oppression, and might have evoked uprisings of the people in some parts of the State, as if there their rights were in danger.

But during this excursion, Mr. Mayer, without any special effort on his part, met with five persons who volunteered to give \$500 each towards the centennial effort; and others expressed their willingness to act with similar liberality in the future, if the Synod should sanction the measure. Thus the proposition to raise so large an amount of money for the institutions at Mercersburg, which some had thought would frighten the whole Church, was after all not regarded as anything too formidable to be accomplished. Plain members in the country thought it could be done.

This overland trip ended at Easton, on the banks of the Delaware, where the party were hospitably entertained by the Reformed ministers, the Rev. Bernard C. Wolff, pastor of the English portion of the congregation, and the Rev. Thomas Pomp, a venerable patriarch of the old school, now verging on his three-score and ten years, still active in serving the German members in the town and country. The latter embodied in

himself the old life of the Church in the best form ; the former, the new, in its progressive, historical and practical character ; and both lived and labored together for the cause of Christ in the utmost concord. They were personal friends of Dr. Rauch, and warmly enlisted in behalf of the institutions at Mercersburg. Here Dr. Nevin, as he was a good listener as well as a good talker, learned much that was useful to him in his work. In Mr. Pomp's library he found some valuable literature bearing on the Heidelberg Catechism, more particularly Van Alpen's *Geschichte und Literatur des Heidelberg'schen Katechismus*, which, with other works of like character, he was looking for.

He had taken it for granted that there was some general spirit or animus of its own distinctive character pervading the German Reformed Church, as something different from the Lutheran, or other evangelical denominations. This he found, as he believed, in its genial Catechism, taken in connection with its historical surroundings ; but to get at its true sense, not that given to it from a foreign standpoint, was not a matter so easy to be accomplished. After a careful study, however, of its fifty-two questions and answers, after preaching on them all from one Lord's-day to another, reproducing its ecclesiastical history in his own mind, the searcher after truth was enabled at length to bring out its meaning or sense in clear and distinct outlines on the printed page, as had never been done before, at least not in this country. It was a problem not easy to solve. Reformed ministers, and laymen also, knew what the Catechism meant, but were somewhat at a loss to know how to express it. It was a matter of consciousness, a part of their life, rather than of clear definition. Hence, when it came to clear expression in the writings of Dr. Nevin, it was at once recognized in all its family features. The study of the Catechism, preëminent as a form of sound words in the Evangelical Church, had much to do in transforming him from a somewhat harsh Puritan divine into the broader German theologian of the Calvinistic-Melanchthonian school, so far as his free, independent nature or constitution would allow of such a transformation.

The Reformed Synod met at Greencastle, Pa., in the latter part of October, not far from Mercersburg, and at the same distance from Chambersburg, where the editors of the church papers and most of the church treasurers resided. All parts of the Church were well represented, the advisory members, of whom Dr. Nevin was one, being about as numerous as the regular delegates. The Rev. Dr. B. C. Wolff was chosen to preside. A general feeling of hopefulness and confidence predominated, and the Synod presented a strong contrast to some of those preceding it, especially the one that had met at Philadelphia in the year 1839. The dark clouds which had hung over the Church, and over its Seminary in particular, had in a great degree passed away and the blue sky of hope seemed to span the heavens. The action of the special Synod at Chambersburg in the election of a new theological professor was heartily approved. The matter of holding a centennial celebration of thanksgiving during the following year occupied much of the time, and every member seemed anxious to give it as wide and useful a range as possible. In reliance, therefore, upon Almighty God, the year 1841 was set apart as a solemn festival of thanksgiving, prayer and praise; sermons and historical discourses were to be delivered; the churches were to bring their thank-offerings to the Lord and unite in raising \$100,000 at least for its poor schools of learning, for missions, education and other worthy objects; subscription-books were to be opened in all the pastoral charges, containing separate columns for each specific object; the brethren in the West were invited to unite in the celebration; a circular was to be addressed to the reverend fathers and brethren in the Fatherland to assist in observing the first centenary of the Reformation in a foreign land; and a pastoral address was to be sent to all the ministers, consistories and members of the Reformed Church in the United States, with Christian greeting, grace and peace to all in the name of Christ on this interesting and important subject. This latter document, prepared by the Rev. Daniel Zacharias, and read to a full Synod, was very forcible, and eloquent too, in a

high degree. It set forth in an impressive manner the propriety of such a movement, and earnestly urged all the people to take part in it. It emphasized the duty of gratitude to God for the past; the importance of a better acquaintance with the history, the doctrines and usages of the Church; the necessity of going forward in building up its various institutions—literary, theological and benevolent, calling for \$100,000 at least to meet the demands of the times; but very properly holding up as the primary object of the celebration to be, in order to arouse the entire Church from Dan to Beersheba; “to awaken an increased attention to vital godliness; and to raise a more devoted standard of Christian piety among us as a people.”

This message went down from the Synod to the congregations, and was everywhere received with respect and thoughtful attention at least. The remainder of the year from October to January was spent in preparation, and no doubt in earnest reflection, so that all things might be ready for active operation at the opening of the new year. Subscription-books by that time were on hand, and such simple agencies were employed as seemed necessary to allow the movement to have a free course and a spontaneous action among the people. In the *Weekly Messenger* of January 8th, accordingly, we already find indications of active operations. In the congregation at Easton a meeting had been held in the German and English languages, and after a brief address by the Rev. M. Mayer, the agent of the Seminary, \$1200 had been subscribed by fourteen individuals, with the prospect of an encouraging increase, as others should make their larger or smaller contributions. From North Carolina a pastor (the Rev. John G. Fritschey), in the same number says that although the churches in his Classis were for the most part feeble, yet he expected that the people of his own charge would raise at least \$1000. Another from Maryland (the Rev. John C. Bucher) writes that his consistory had pledged themselves for \$4,000, one-half of which had already been subscribed, and that some other congregations in his Classis, more wealthy, might or could do more. At Mercersburg quite an

enthusiastic meeting had been held under the direction of the Classis, at which a number of generous contributions had been made. Dr. Rauch had pledged himself for \$500 and Professor Samuel W. Budd for a like amount. Others in the congregation and on the outside had also subscribed liberally. The ladies in the Presbyterian Congregation had nearly completed their scholarship in Marshall College; on the Reformed side the ladies were trying to do the same thing; and twenty students in the institutions had engaged to raise \$25 each in five years to complete a scholarship of their own. Dr. Nevin gave \$1,000 for himself and family, which was probably the largest amount contributed during the Centenary Year. He thought the whole sum would not fall short of \$4,000, and was confident that in the end it would be much larger.

The year thus auspiciously opened retained its festive character throughout. It was formally closed on the 25th of December, as a day of general thanksgiving, on which devotional services were held early in the morning and a suitable sermon delivered afterwards at 11 o'clock A.M., at which the Centennial Hymn, written for the occasion by Mrs. Lydia Jane Pierson, the sweet singer of Tioga County, was sung, no doubt, with one heart and one voice. But as some of the congregations were behindhand, circumstances preventing them from doing their part at the time with the others, the celebration was extended over another year, which was not without its good effects. The movement became general in the East, and the scattered congregations in the Western Synod, standing in no immediate connection with the mother Synod in the East, felt its influence, blowing as a healthy breeze over the mountains from the homes and churches in which many of the members or their parents had been reared in their youth.

The year was a memorable one—*Annus Memorabilis*, truly. No such an uprising in the Reformed Church had ever occurred before. Most probably over \$100,000 were subscribed by the Reformed people during the year for one or another branch of

benevolence—mostly for 500 scholarships in the college—although, as is usual in such cases, for various reasons a considerable amount was never collected and paid over. Under the peculiar circumstances of the case all this was something remarkable—a step in advance—an epoch in the Church—the beginning of a new and more prosperous period, fully justifying Dr. Nevin's good opinion of our American Germans: "That under proper direction the same spirit that prompted them to bestow so much attention on their places of worship may easily be brought to act with corresponding liberality and zeal in support of all other objects of a religious kind."

With others he took a wide and comprehensive view of the objects to be reached in the Centennial Celebration. He thought that the Church ought to be studied, not only in its history during the preceding century, but by rights all the way back to its rise in Switzerland and Germany. It was only in this way that it could come to a proper feeling of self-consciousness, and be qualified to act its appropriate part in the future history of the country. He therefore commenced a series of articles in the church paper under the general caption of *Heidelberg Catechism*, twenty-nine in number, which continued to appear in the *Messenger*, with occasional interruption, from the close of the year 1840 into the year 1842.

They constitute a brief but comprehensive history of the Reformed Church, including that of the Catechism, from its origin in Switzerland, its progress in Germany, Holland, and then afterwards in this country. Properly speaking it could have its origin neither in one or another of these countries. Whilst the Reformation may be regarded as a new order of life in the history of Christianity, it stood, more properly speaking, in the closest vital connection with the same history as it unfolded itself, century after century, from the time of the Apostles. In the beginning it was one and the same movement towards a higher, a freer and more evangelical Church; but it included in its beginnings two different tendencies, which, with a conscious underlying sense of oneness, nevertheless failed at the very

outset, finally came into full opposition, and so in the end resolved themselves into two distinct communions or confessions. The one gathered around Martin Luther and Wittenberg—the other came first to expression in the free atmosphere of Switzerland; but the outburst of the same great movement in different lands was so nearly simultaneously in France, England, Scotland, Holland and Germany that it would be most unhistorical to claim for it any merely national rise.

A considerable number of the articles on the Catechism consist of vivid sketches of the colossal figures of the great Reformers—more particularly on the Reformed side: of Ulric Zwingli, who set Switzerland on fire with his fervid eloquence, and rose up above the men of his day, much as his native mountains shoot up beyond the surrounding plains of Europe; of Martin Luther, the most important link in the historical chain of the Reformation, in whose person the living spirit of the Reformation individualized itself under its most vital and characteristic form; and then of Farel, Bullinger, and especially of John Calvin and Melancthon. The articles on the second Sacramentarian controversy are exhaustive and of great value. The essays, unusually long for a newspaper but full of substantial instruction, were the first to be looked for as they appeared, and the first to be read. They added immensely to the value and character of the paper. When they were completed they were repeatedly called for in a more prominent form, and in response to this request Dr. Nevin published his "*History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism*," in 1847, pp. 160. It is sometimes thought that this volume is simply the republication of the essays, but this is a mistake. Substantially they are the same, but it is true of both that each contains a large amount of valuable matter that is not to be found in the other. Thus, in the latter there is much that is interesting and valuable, which is not found in the former. In the former, after further study and reflection, the author, with a vigor and originality all his own, proceeds to

define more particularly the theology of the Catechism, its ecumenical and churchly character, its objectivity, its practical spirit, its freedom from Pelagianism, its reserve in regard to High Calvinism on the subject of Calvinism, and its ideas of the Sacraments and good works. It was a Calvinistic book with regard to the Lord's Supper, the great question of its day, but it significantly passed over the subject of the decrees, holding fast to the doctrine of divine grace, supposed by some to be best sustained by the metaphysical theory of predestination. This irenical character it received from the influence of Melancthon, and, we may add, the aversion of German Christianity toward the one-sidedness of the great dogma, which subsequently became more characteristic of Calvinism than the view of the Eucharist, from which it had originally started out.

The year 1841, as we have seen, was a year of refreshing and revival from the presence of the Lord. But just as it was auspiciously opening, death on its sable wings entered the halls at Mercersburg. Dr. Rauch, upon whom so much was built, and from whom so much was reasonably expected, took sick and died at his post on the 2d of March, 1841, in the midst of his rising fame. It was a severe blow to a large circle of devoted friends of the institution, and to none more so than to Dr. Nevin. In the fall of 1840, it had become apparent that his physical and mental energies had been overtaxed, and that his strength was failing. He, however, was comparatively young in years—not as yet thirty-five years old—and it was difficult to believe that the end of his career was so near at hand. Just as he was about to begin the preparation of his treatise on Christian Ethics for the press, he was confined to the bed from which he never rose. He was stricken down just at a time when his presence in the college seemed to be most needed, and his loss, tragic in appearance, seemed to be irreparable. It was a sad day to the professors and students when they came to realize the fact that Rauch, the amiable Christian gentleman, the profound philosopher and theologian, and the paternal

President of Marshall College, was now no more among them. A similar feeling of profound sorrow pervaded the community and the Church generally when the public papers announced his unexpected death. His greatness and the value of his life were more fully brought to view by Dr. Nevin in the admirable Eulogium of his Life and Character, which he delivered at the end of the college term to a large audience of sympathizing friends and admirers of the deceased.

At the urgent request of the trustees and the friends of the college, Dr. Nevin consented to fill the chair thus vacated temporarily, or until some other person could be secured to take charge of it permanently. Owing to the straitened circumstances of the college, no successor could be appointed, and so it devolved on him, therefore, to act as President of the college until it was removed to Lancaster, in 1853. His duties and responsibilities were thus vastly increased, all of which he endured in the most heroic manner. Without any doubt he was the best qualified person in the Church or country to step in and take charge of the work where Dr. Rauch had left off, so as to teach Anglo-German Philosophy in a manner satisfactory to the students and Alumni. By judicious management the faculty was strengthened and enlarged; the students and friends of the college rallied under the new presidency; and the institution started out under new auspices upon a career of increasing usefulness and prosperity, without any change in its life and spirit. Dr. Nevin, hitherto almost exclusively a theologian, now found it incumbent on him to study German philosophy in its various schools more thoroughly, in which, as his friends all knew, he made rapid progress, and profited above many of his equals in his own nation.

V.

SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF ETHNIC RELIGION.

BY PROFESSOR EML. V. GERHART, DD., LL.D.

OF the leading characteristics of natural religious life I mention *four* that it is important to emphasize :

A religion, or some system of religious belief, is, with its institutions of worship, a spiritual *necessity* regnant in the history of man.

The necessity of some religious belief and of divine worship is *fundamental* in the human constitution, and in the edifice of civilization.

This fundamental necessity is not acquired, but *innate* ; not abstract nor engrafted, but *concrete*.

The natural religious life *develops itself spontaneously* with the development of individual history, and with the growth of the nation and the State.

1. Ethnic religion is a *necessity*. The necessity is internal, being present and active in the depths of the human spirit. It is dynamic—a potent energy in the organism of the race. All opinions of the origin of religion which ascribe it either to accidental causes, or to the influence of external circumstances, have to be dismissed as unwarranted.

Man is created in the image of God. He became a living soul by divine inbreathing. (Gen. ii. 7). Living soul, or spiritual being in affinity with divine being, constitutes the pivotal difference between man and all sub-human kingdoms. This permanent imageship, this constitutional kinship with the Divine, cannot but assert itself in a direction toward God and the transcendent spiritual world. Thus arise the beliefs of

mythology, religious institutions, and the ceremonies of worship.

A particular belief and a particular cult may be, as was the religion of Mahomet, imposed on a nation by external force; but not the religious life. The religious life renders it possible that one system of worship may be suppressed, and another system substituted in its stead. But some divine beliefs, some rites of religious service, a people must have—a fact supported, not only by mythologies, but by pagan philosophy, and by universal history. An irrepressible heavenward or transcendent force moves and works from within dynamically, shaping the form of national endowments, and directing the action of psychic faculties. There is no escape, no alternative. Living soul will, in a degree, be true to the impulses of its undying kinship with its Author; even though the principle of evil may be mistaken for the principle of good. It moves from itself toward another, a some One, or a somewhat, above itself, to whom or to which it feels itself bound by an unchanging bond.* If the religious impulse be impoverished by ignorance, as in Africa, or restrained by violence, as among materialistic scientists, its phenomena, instead of perishing, may be the more contradictory and monstrous; and the measure of hideous distortion will be

* On this point I quote the celebrated passage of Tertullian: "This is the crowning guilt of men, that they will not recognize One of whom they cannot possibly be ignorant. Would you have the proof from the works of His hands, so numerous and so great, which both contain you and sustain you, which minister at once to your enjoyment and strike you with awe; or would you rather have it from the testimony of the soul itself? Though under the oppressive bondage of the body, though led astray by depraving customs, though enervated by lusts and passions, though in slavery to false gods; yet, whenever the soul comes to itself, as out of a surfeit, or a sleep, or a sickness, and attains something of its natural soundness, it speaks of God; using no other word, because this is the peculiar name of the true God. 'God is great and good,' 'Which may God give,' are the words on every lip. It bears witness, too, that God is judge, exclaiming: 'God sees,' and, 'I commend myself to God,' and, 'God will repay you.' O noble testimony of the soul by nature Christian! Then, too, in using such words as these, it looks, not to the capitol, but to the heavens. It knows that there is the throne of the living God, as from Him and from thence itself came down."—*Apology*, ch. xvii.

in proportion to the measure of violent restraint, or the poverty of ignorance, or the perverting influence of false science. Even theoretic atheism may demonstrate its self-contradictoriness by provoking in the lives of its abettors horrid religious phenomena, such as profane swearing, and spiritualistic seances. Profane oaths and cursings are inverted prayers.

Recognizing the origin and the divine potencies of living soul, an ethnic religion cannot be ascribed to tradition. The relation of tradition to religion is directly the opposite. The natural religious life informing the imagination, begets spiritual aspirations, historical myths, and superstitious rites. These become the content of the religious consciousness, and by the law of heredity beliefs and opinions and customs live on in a nation, descending with its resistless currents from one generation to another; but beliefs are perennially vitalized by the undying divine instincts of the human spirit. If the hidden interaction of God with man did not prevail; if, in other words, the natural religious life would become extinct, all mythological traditions, for lack of nutriment, would in course of time wither and perish, like a tree not planted by "the streams of water."

Nor is religion the effect of education. Adhesion to some particular system, a particular belief or a particular cult may, like civil laws and social customs, be perpetuated from one generation to another by teaching and training; but not man's spiritual constitution; this no more than his physical organization. Here also the reverse order is the real order. Education *presupposes* the religious life. By it religious education is suggested and animated.

Much less can religion be an invention. This notion would reduce it to the level of artifice; and it would be an artifice without an artificer, or a product without a corresponding producing cause. As an invention in mechanics presupposes a mechanician, as a discovery in science presupposes a scientific discoverer, so the invention of religion presupposes a religious inventor. Otherwise the most universal, persistent and thorough habit of the human race would have no ground in humanity, but

would be referable to a trick of cunning or an accident of ingenuity.

Nor yet may it be said that fear originates religion. So Iucretius taught: *Timor facit deos*. The opinion has had some advocates among modern unbelievers. It is self-contradictory. Belief in the existence of a divine being, at least a perception or sense of a transcendent spiritual realm, goes before the dread of the supernatural. Psychologically and logically, the fear of spiritual beings depends on belief in some occult power mightier than men. Besides, it is important to bear in mind the kind of direct influence that fear exerts. Its object is the evil, not the good. Fear does not attract; it repels. Instead of drawing the heart towards a joyous service of deity, natural dread drives men away from the divine presence. It is written: "Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God among the trees of the garden."

Superstitious fears, inventive genius, education and tradition have each and all been modifying forces in the history of ethnic religions, producing an admixture of phenomena, sometimes conserving the better dispositions and counteracting the worse; sometimes strengthening the elements of evil and enervating or repressing the strength of the good. These and other factors may bring in a better religion among a people than their own, or introduce a religion more degrading and sensual. But of the changes wrought by such superficial forces, or of the perpetuity of a particular religion through a series of ages in a nation or in a race, the subconscious religious life, the constant interaction between infinite Spirit and finite spirit, is the ever-living principle. Men are religious by virtue of a dynamic more original than any attribute or endowment of their being.

2. In man's psychological constitution the law of life necessitating a religious habit is a *fundamental* or central necessity; a law deeper than the laws of judgment or of reasoning, deeper also than conscious freedom of choice between different objects of the will.

Our mental and moral faculties stand in the religious prin-

ciple. As man is an organic unity, even his corporeal powers cannot be sundered from the formative influence of personality. Individuals or nations may endeavor to obey their spiritual instincts in harmony with the dictates of conscience; or they may resist these instincts and violate the conscience. In both alternatives the religious principle performs a function which is central. If the dynamic moving the heart toward the service and worship of the Divine be obeyed, religion may become the internal positive force governing aims and conduct agreeably to the behests of conscience, whether the religion be of the nobler or the more degrading class. If the law written on the heart be violated and the inborn tendency to divine service be stifled, then there is a war within, a conflict between the conscience of religion and the arbitrariness and recklessness of passion, a conflict in which self is arrayed against self. But the conflict does not exhaust itself; it continues; and the confusion of horrible phenomena continues. These phenomena are a caricature of divine fellowship, inasmuch as the religious principle is a persistent positive principle. It maintains the conflict against perversion, and thus fundamentally conditions the horrid phenomena of spiritual wickedness. Were the conscience of religion to perish, the terrors of superstition and the horrors of pagan rituals would vanish.

Logical thought in the sphere of science or philosophy presupposes an original truth or a fundamental hypothesis. Laws of reason require thought to pass from the particular to the general, from classes of phenomena to laws, from laws to an ultimate Truth, to which all truths, all laws, all phenomena are referable. Whether held to be personal or impersonal, that Truth, that Power, or the rational necessity of postulating an unknowable Cause, bears witness to the presence and efficiency of the subconscious relationship, the spiritual bond immanent in mankind binding God and the "living soul" in permanent communion. It is the spontaneous response of the soul to God in the preconscious domain of personal existence which, asserting itself in processes of thought, dictates the search of phil-

osophy after the Cause which is uncaused, or after an Author of things who is *causa sui*.

When scientific investigation takes a materialistic or anti-theistic direction, the religious instinct does not abdicate. It keeps the throne. Logical thought must honor a regnant Power. There is no alternative. If it will not look upward, it must look downward. If it will not acknowledge that Power to be creative Spirit, it will go in search elsewhere; but an all-embracing "potency" it must have. Said Professor Tyndall, in his celebrated address, delivered at Belfast in 1875: "I believe that matter contains the promise and potency of every form and quality of life." The human reason cannot wholly break away from the absolute reason. Thought, in spite of contrary efforts, will be religious. Science will have some principle that contains the promise and potency of every form and quality of life, even if it has to take refuge in speculative feticism.

The religious life is the foundation of the ethical. The idea of right and wrong involves the sense of responsibility. I feel bound to do the right. I disapprove and condemn the wrong. Whether a Plato or an Epicurus, all must ask: What is the right? What is the criterion of a sound moral judgment? What is the ultimate ground of moral obligation? By whom or by what am I bound to do the right and shun the wrong? Whatever be the answers given to these questions, whether spiritual and theistic, as by Plato, or materialistic and sensual, as by Epicurus, they presuppose the moral order of the world, or the relation of man, a moral agent, to God, the moral Governor. It is the vital force of this fundamental connection, active in the conscience and in the moral nature, which makes ethical phenomena possible; not only possible, but renders them unavoidable and indestructible. The testimony of history is unequivocal and uniform. Profane swearing, perjury, and the worst forms of wickedness, all involve a caricature of the religious life. Immorality is rooted in irreligion; and irreligion is man's perversion of the constant action of immanent Love.

Ethnic religion in actual development may be comparatively true to itself, and thus produce men possessing some moral strength, some nobleness of character, as in Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius; or its developments may be altogether abnormal and self-contradictory, and thus produce indescribable degradation and misery, as among the immense masses in heathendom or among the dregs of society in Christian lands. In both cases it is the relation and interaction between God and man which is the fundamental condition. To the degree that this fundamental relation is normally active may all phenomena of human life in the sphere of the will and in the sphere of the intellect, in the line of individual history or in the line of national history, be comparatively good and ennobling; and reversely, to the degree that this relation is active abnormally, whether from vicious impulses or from willful perverseness, will the phenomena of human life in every sphere be inhuman and vile. No other relation has the same determinative influence for weal or woe on the entire complex organism of mankind.

As human life begins in the religious, so it seeks to complete itself in the religious. The conscious fellowship of man with God is the most exalted fellowship of which the individual or the race is capable. In it the processes of history, the aims and enjoyments of men, culminate. The knowledge of God is the acme of knowledge. The most sublime Object that addresses our knowing capacities, Deity is discerned and rightly apprehended in proportion to the degree that the religious life is normally developed and conscious divine fellowship is active in harmony with the intent of the divine inbreathing.

We find that the classic poets of Greece and Rome assign the highest place on the scale of honor to the men who in their heroic deeds have been distinguished by their piety, or by the service of the gods, agreeably to the laws and rites of the accepted religion. The sentiments of the most cultured heathen, Plato for example, make obedience to the divine will or godlikeness, the noblest attainable end. The fact that pagan conceptions of God are defective and pagan worship is

in many instances immoral and degrading, and that the notion of godliness is often revolting, does not contradict the truth that religion, according to the intuitive perceptions of the better paganism, is the one great end to which other ends are subordinated.

Planted in the soil of divinity and ever receiving spiritual nourishment from it, the tree of human life bears fruit that has in it divine qualities. The fruit is in kind like the tree. It shows God's immanent action at war with the perverting principle of moral evil. The fruit may be good; it may be the product of conscious efforts to serve God according to the law written on the heart. The fruit may be bad; yielding to the impulses of sin the masses turn against God and transgress the dictates of conscience. When bad as when good, the fruit bears traces of its ethico-religious origin. The sensuality, the cruelties and the wickedness of the heathen derive idiosyncrasies of an abnormal character from violence done to the necessary relation of the "living soul" to its Author.

3. The religious principle is a part of man's essential nature. It is inborn, not acquired; and it is concrete, being wrought into the texture of the human organism.

When I affirm that the religious principle is inborn and concrete, I only express a particular phase of the truth that belief in a transcendent Being and some rites of worship are a necessity—a necessity which is internal and constitutional.

Men are conceived and born in vital relation to God. The relation comprehends not one faculty of the soul, nor a class of faculties, but the essence and entirety of manhood. Hence religion in itself is not a sentiment, whether true or false, nor an outward law, nor even an acquired habit, not a habit acquired by association or merely from the influence of spiritual environments. From the first moment of existence the spiritual forces of this fundamental correlation to God are wrought into the functions of individual life, into the instincts, the desires and inclinations, and in process of time wrought into all the phenomena of personality. But we have ever to re-

member that this living innate religiousness, owing to the poison of moral evil, may assert itself either under a prevailingly positive form, in the disposition and the services of piety, or under a prevailingly negative form, in the viciousness and wilful wickedness of impiety. But whether comparatively normal or abnormal, the necessity in personality of feeling and willing, of thinking and acting in a relation to God, whether recognized as supernatural and superhuman or not, is operative in the functions and relations of social life.

Therefore it cannot be said that the religious *life* depends on the exercise of conscious will. Volition conditions righteousness and unrighteousness, conditions the conscientious observance of religious rites or the neglect and abuse of religious rites. But the direction taken by the will toward the *service* of the *gods*, or against this service, is conditioned on the religious quality of human life. The activities of volition, whether pious or impious, presuppose the spontaneous plastic force of the immanent spiritual law binding man to God from the beginning of his existence.

Nor can it be said that religion is merely a mode of thought, or an inherited superstition, or a stubborn habit of the social economy. Modes of thought concerning the gods are indeed prevalent; but modes of thought are developed for the reason that the divine relationship, active from within, enters into consciousness and impels to reflection on divine things. Superstitions are false beliefs. They substitute the creature for the Creator; and invest the creature with supercreatural powers. Superstitions arise and perpetuate themselves because the belief in a superhuman and supernatural world is fed from the soil of divinity in which man lives. So we have also to judge respecting spiritual habits. A habit of the soul and of the social economy religion certainly is; there is no room for controversy; but it is a habit, a stubborn habit, because an outgrowth of the human constitution, like speech, or the family, or the state. The interior spiritual law informs and fashions rational processes and the exterior social organization. But, if we may

appropriate the words of Paul to corresponding possibilities among the heathen, the work of this interior law is to those who by nature do the things contained in the moral law the savor of life unto life, whilst to those that are contentious and do not obey the truth it is the savor of death unto death. The one class when they hear the proclamation of the Gospel mature the inborn capability of appropriating redemption by faith in Jesus Christ, but the other class mature an abnormal character which qualifies them for coming "indignation and wrath."

4. Ethnic religion is the life of heathen life ; hence a growth, a growth from a divine-human germ. Unfolding itself from within, religion grows with the growth of the individual, of the family, and of the nation. The ordinary conditions of the nation's physical, intellectual and moral life are the conditions for the unfolding of the nation's religious life. The religious as it is the deepest and dominant factor, asserts its power and develops itself in and with other essential factors of manhood. Beliefs, aspirations, hopes, prayers and worship come, as other necessary phenomena come, by the spontaneous action of human personality, modified by the choices of conscious will.

Religion is not merely an individual interest. Its influence for good or for evil is not circumscribed by any lines. Religion underlies and permeates all estates of the social organism. Shaping the conduct and habits of the individual, it is no less the formative force in the family, in the tribe, in the nation, also in the laws, organization and government of the State, than it really is in the accepted cultus. For example, take Egypt as represented in Uarda by Ebers.

Moreover among the civilized nations of paganism religion gives the characteristic tone to science ; it inspires art and it rules in philosophy. Greece perhaps may afford the best illustration. The ideals of beauty for sculpture and painting, for poetry and architecture are suggested by mythology. The history of Grecian philosophy, from Thales to Aristotle, is the search after the first Principle, the *ἀρχή*, of all things. Thales

supposed this beginning to be water, ὕδωρ; Pythagoras number, ἀριθμός; Anaximander the infinite, τὸ ἀπείρον; Anaximenes the air, ἀήρ; Anaxagoras the mind, νοῦς; Socrates and Plato knowledge, γνῶσις; Aristotle self-sufficiency, resolved into two imperatives, ἀνέχου καὶ ἀπέχου. Each unfolded his system from his own hypothesis respecting the first principle; but the question whether there was a first principle did not arise until positive thought was undermined by skepticism. That all things had a beginning, ἀρχή, was an axiomatic truth; it was the postulate of the profoundest thinkers of Greece. Subordinate problems are concerned with relations of spirit and matter, good and evil, soul and body, the ideal and real. Directly or indirectly they proceed from the fundamental question respecting the quality of the relation subsisting between the divine world and the human world.

Education, intelligence and social conscientiousness may aid in the culture and elevation of the religious life. Ignorance, wickedness and savage sensuality will deform, corrupt and caricature it. But as neither the one nor the other national temper can originate religion, so neither can any antagonism overthrow it, nor any downward tendencies of civilization toward barbarism destroy its radical energies. No error of science, no materialistic philosophy, no atheistic theories can annul the vital interaction between infinite Spirit and finite spirit nor abolish its characteristic phenomena, a fact demonstrated by the history of all nations.

VI.

DIVINE PROVIDENCE: GENERAL AND SPECIAL.

BY REV. C. Z. WEISER, D.D.

FIFTY years ago the conviction that a Creator—an Infinite, Supreme and Perfect Deity—exists, whose nature inclines unalterably towards the highest good, mankind cherished as firmly as the human mind holds any one of the universally accepted axioms of truth. And possessing this certitude, the kosmos of the universe was ever regarded as the great treasury-house, whence the strongest proof of the being of a God must necessarily be derived. "If you ask for a monument of a God," it was commonly said, "look aloft and around; consider the unity, harmony and design in nature."

To-day, however, the Theist finds his once fruitful field invaded by the Deist and Agnostic, to harvest in, and to carry away some of the choicest stones for erecting the walls of their temple of doubt and unbelief. The believer in the ancient and respectable tradition, that "in the beginning God created the Heavens and the Earth, with all that is therein," is confronted by the sharp-cutting criticism:—"The realm of Nature abounds in disharmonies, too; in imperfections and accidents; in cruelties and sufferings—in irregularities—as well as in grand designs—which hardly comport with the character of an alleged Omnipotent, Omniscient and all-good God, who either would not, or could not forestall their intrusions."

And furthermore; conceding a supposed Deity to have originated and endowed Nature's laws with their potent energies in their genesis, might He still not have abandoned the universe to the vicissitudes of a purblind fate, or to the fickleness of man's

free will? If mankind cannot positively assure itself that its individual members, and every one of the myriads of creatures 'in the heavens above, in the earth beneath, and in the waters under the earth,' is likewise a subject of a Divine Providence, or not too insignificant a being to demand His constant notice and solicitude; and especially so, in the case of human beings, who are supposed to be always engaged in a struggle to please their God—then, God is after all no God to Nature and the individualizations of Nature, notwithstanding His presumed Perfections."

The force of such animadversions is felt by all thoughtful minds. If Atheism be unsatisfactory, Deism proves itself to be still less so, and far more inconsistent, to boot. Man might, indeed, continue to admire the Creator's wisdom, displayed in and throughout the universe, in countless directions; His omnipotence might astound him; yet were Nature's vast domain, at best, but an amazing MECHANISM, constructed *ab origine*, by a tender master-hand, but violently weaned, at its maturity, and coldly forsaken for ever. Thus every stone in the base of Theism must ultimately sink out of sight; the canon for moral conduct must be entirely obliterated; the rock upon which man's peace and happiness rest must crumble to dust, and his future destiny were as vague to himself, as though there were no God.

It behooves the Theist, consequently, to inquire whether God does not so authenticate Himself, as also to afford His noblest offspring some certitude as to the *Disposition and Relation which He sustains to mankind*? Is it conceivable, according to our sense of the fitness of things in general, that God would conduct man so far on his way towards truth and happiness—half-way, let us assume—and abandon him for the latter half, or balance of the road? Is it in accordance with common and every-day logic, to hold, that a being, who exhibits Himself in lines quite parallel with human reason—so far as man is competent to extend those lines—touching His attribute of wisdom and knowledge—should not also illuminate man's vision suffi-

ciently to discern a similar parallelism and consistency with the attribute of Goodness, so far as God and man may be assumed to hold such goodness in common? Does not the postulate—"God is Good"—lie in an embryonic state also in the pregnant and parturient propositions—"God is the Omniscient and Omnipotent Being?" And will not filial love follow easily and readily in the wake of man's profound reverence?

The creed of the Theist is big with momentous truths; but it is, nevertheless, briefly and simply formulated. He believes that God is the Creator of the Universe, and that His Will is the original source of all existences; who allotted to all creatures their peculiar natures; endowed these with fitting capacities of special functions; assigned to all their exactly suited environments; determined their several epochs; and adjusted their mutual relations, as by most delicate balances.

Read in this light, the economy of Nature demands an Omniscient, Omnipotent and Good Being, as its Creator. His Omniscience necessarily involves a perfect knowledge of all things; of their changes and results, as well as an intimate consciousness of motives, reasons and consequences. The entire constitution of the universe, why He called creation into existence, and whether His ultimate aim is being gained, must be momentarily present and patent to His infinite mind, otherwise Omniscience were not Omniscience, and whatever order and harmony, or manifest design, is apparent in Nature (which confessedly overbalances all seeming disorder) must be traced to chance—which involves a severer tax on human credulity than any creed of man or God's conception ever brought forth. We might as well speak of the *capacious credulity of infidelity*, or of the *bold belief of unbelievers*. To suppose a divine intention to have moved the mind of God, already at the genesis of creation, we must also allow it to continue in force, while Nature is a perennial phenomenon, notwithstanding the ceaseless dissolutions, reconstructions or changes which momentarily transpire within its realm. The identity of Nature is not destroyed. The planets retain their original matter, without any visible

essential exchanges. The elements—air, water, fire, minerals, and primeval atoms of all things—are subject to endless transitions and recombinations; yet are they ever composed of their original constituents; their mass, measure of force, and relations continue undiminished and unchanged. During one or more seasons, at most, in a century or two, the entire mass of organic matter may be said to have completed its cycle, and returned once more to its primary condition. Withal, every species of creature-life—their peculiar structures, powers, instincts and correlations—continues faithful to its primeval type. All perish, but all again are resurrected, by virtue of certain fixed and uniform laws.

We may explain the unvarying continuity of Nature as we choose; whether as the result of a fixedly arranged mechanism, with which the Creator has no further part or lot, than that He originated it, and adjusted its parts in the beginning—abandoning it subsequently to the energies of its inherent laws; or we may hold to an unceasing influx of His Omnipotent Creating Will; the same conclusion follows, *to wit: That no effect manifests itself in the universe which the Creator is not at all times conscious or aware of.*

Whatever difficulty men may find in realizing the truth of this proposition, it is ever found to lie in their misappropriations of the term *fore-knowledge*. "The fact is 'fore-knowledge' belongs to man, not to God. It is a prerogative applicable to creatures solely—to finite and created intellects; but not to an intellect that is Infinite and Creating. To attribute the faculty of *fore-knowing* to God, is to degrade rather than to exalt Him. The past and the future, that which was, and is to come, are both to God as present—all is an *eternal now*. God knows and sees all things, but *foreknows* and *foresees* nothing. 'Before' or 'after,' 'far' or 'near,' 'above' and 'below,' 'now' and then,'—these are quite intelligible terms when applied to man, who exists in Time and Space; but they have no meaning when applied to the Omnipresent, Omniscient, Eternal God, who is the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever, and to whom yesterday

and forever are an everlasting to-day. To admit His Omnipresence, and to deny His Omniscience, were to concede His simultaneous presence in Space but not in Time. There is no succession as to Time, just as there is no distance as to Space with God. All things are present to God, therefore; the motive and the moment; man and his act. To God's Omniscience, all things and actions are looked upon as *done*; and they are seen, therefore, because they are done—not *done*, because they are seen. Hence, foreknowledge, as applied to God, with its necessary deduction—Fore-Ordination—with its lame conclusions and libertine consequences, falls a baseless fabric to the ground.”—(*Colton's Lacon.*)

If it be correct to say, that the Creator is never surprised, but confronted constantly by His myriads of creatures, with their entire histories, the conclusion is likewise involved, that mankind is the object of His constant notice and regard—a thought, than which no other can minister more largely to the consolation of the human soul.

The Theist is not unmindful of the bold challenge which the Deist casts at his feet:

“Alas! vain man! The fancy which he is so ready to cherish concerning his nearness to the Deity, is derogatory to so exalted a Being. It is humiliating to God's character to imagine because man forms an infinitesimal particle of Creation, he is therefore also an object of divine solicitude, from dawn to doom, through all the ages. When will mortals learn to entertain nobler conceptions of the Creator? God verily created Nature—the Universe of Worlds; yet not according to man's puerile notions and carpenter theories, which teach him to believe that the ant and the acorn busied His Infinite and Eternal Mind, when He called Nature into existence, and that He minutely and *seriatim* determined in his Omniscience, at what precise point mortals were to be, as well as the Ephemera, which dance for a moment in the sunbeam. God verily did create the Universe with all its denizens; but He created as a God. He called into existence the domain of Creature-life,

with all its species ; He assigned to all and each their natures, places and relations, by and through the *Laws of Nature*, by whose energies they came into existence, and by whose energies also they continue to exist. It were vanity and impertinence mounted on stilts to think all His ever-efficient Laws, by which myriads of worlds were brought into being, to be insufficient to bring forth man, and to leave it further necessary to superinduce an order of Providence, in view of his ever-recurring wants. Why longer dwell on the energies of Nature's Laws, if they yet leave room for God to act as a task-master over individual creatures ? All things will and must end after God's great, grand plan, through the *media* of irrevocable and infallible Laws. There is no need of a constant and detailed inspection. The majesty of the Deity, His Wisdom and Power are fully indicated in the universal harmony and regularity of all things. It were absurd to think of God as watching every grain of sand, wherever a storm-wave washes it along the ocean's shore. And so, too, may mortals occupy positions here or there in the concatenation of the Race, the Universe is what it is, regardless of their presence ; it was and will be the same, ere man constituted a part, and when he is no more. The Omnipotence and Omniscience reveal themselves in the provision which his Laws have secured for Nature's totality. Their sovereignty challenges obedience from the individual parts through the deference of the whole—the links are in place, since the chain is where and as it is. Hence the Deity surveys the hosts of an Alexander, and the fly's ripples on the bosom of the lake with like equanimity. God's plan is affected by neither ; individual disturbances cannot change ultimate results. An army of locusts may light upon a plain and devour every blade of grass and grain ; murrain may empty the husbandman's stall of his choicest kine ; the Race may array itself in hostile forces and threaten mutual extermination ; mortals may tremble at the prospect of carnage, death and extinction ; they cry aloud in their perplexity for deliverance, lest God's honor might suffer. 'The Lord sitteth in the heavens and laughs at their fears,'

and remains serenely calm. He well knows that His Eternal Ordinances will survive the greed of insects, the ravages of pestilence and the puny passions of mankind.

A little while and the stalls and barns are again stored with cattle and provender. And should Nature's paroxysms break forth afresh, in a decade or two, God is not forced to a new Creation, or to descend from His throne in the heavens, to repair the devastations and ruins on earth. He never succumbs to His Universal Laws by what men call Providential acts, but calmly entrusts all individual disturbances to their own repairing potencies and the intelligence of His human creatures.

Thus the history of Human Society becomes intelligible also. The callous miser owns the largest treasures, whilst the philanthropist verily sighs for a wealth to scatter with a free hand. A Tiberius grows gray on his throne, whilst a Titus dare hardly bless a people beyond a few years. A Domitian and a Henry IVth leave the world under like circumstances. When and where does modest worth obtain its reward? Innocence is helplessly betrayed, and no Nemesis pursues the libertine. A benefactor offers holocausts, and dies in a dungeon, whilst the foul-mouthed blasphemer walks abroad in triumph, and dies on a bed of down. Say, when and where did an avenging Providence quench the flame that licked a holy martyr's blood, which a thirsty tyrant or blind zealot set ablaze, to reduce knowledge or truth to ashes? Who can any longer acquiesce in such opposite and contradictory maxims as that a Divine Providence embraces the individual destinies of all mundane affairs, and that such patent abnormities may, nevertheless, transpire? When has Divine Providence been moved with tender compassion by the sincerest prayers of a poor man in behalf of his roof-tree that stood in the way of a threatening conflagration? Or, when did the loud and persistent cries of men, women and children divert a sweeping flood from the farmer's hard-earned acres and crops? The mortals fall to their knees, and prostrate their faces to the dust; amid the shriekings of supplications all

things hold on their heartless way, and follow in their marked channels until the destined end is reached.

And were God both ready and willing to heed the cry of mankind, what a bedlam must ensue! Let men cease to dream of a special Providence, which can only be conceived of as derogating from the character of the Deity, and which were of no utility to the Race. Rather let them see, on the other hand, that the Infinite Creator is of far too exalted a nature to concern Himself, in the least degree, about their countless nothingness, or that of any insignificant creature as such."

The gist of the indictment which the Deist brings against the creed of the Theist, touching a Divine Providence, is that God carries no concern or solicitude for mankind—that He, indeed, ignores man entirely. And this is maintained on the charge that God is of too exalted a nature to conceive of Him as deigning to notice any individual creature of His hand—a thought which is of so licentious a kind as to involve a denial of all intelligence in Creation, all morality in Human Society, all sanctity in Duty, all authority in Law, and the banishment of God from the realm of Nature.

It must be confessed that if we survey the galaxy of worlds, countless in multitude and boundless in extent, and suffer our imagination to roam unchecked over the infinite regions of suns, whose light may not yet have struck our globe, though emanating from the dawn of Time, or if we strive to reach the circumference of the circle, of which our terrestrial sphere serves us as an imaginary centre; and if, on the other hand, we reflect on the relative diminutiveness of the earth, and, still further, on man's personal littleness upon it—his short stay, his small room and speedy extinction—then the discouraging inquiry may verily haunt us, whether even God's Omniscience is competent to discern man's nothingness, his conduct and history. The most stalwart Theist is ready to voice his sense of human vanity in the cry of the Psalmist: "What is man that Thou art mindful of him!" Manifestly if the worth of mankind is to be pronounced on according to bulk or size, the Human Race falls

below pyramids, cedars and elephants. Carlyle touched the sensitive nerve of scientism when he speaks of an unfortunate tribe along the Dead Sea whose masters gazed so long and so intently at worlds in the distance as to forget that they had souls, and at last turned into apes.

It has been facetiously remarked that the famous precept, the "*a cælo descendit, 'Gnothi Seanton*" has not yet reached *terra firma*, and must be suspected as *still on its journey*, since wisecracks see all things abroad and far away, rather than what lies at home and within themselves. The moment we recollect that the Infinite Creator is also Omnipresent, or ubiquitously at hand, as well as Omniscient; that He is alike the Author of worlds and of mankind—a Race most akin to Himself—then, too, the meaning and worth of man individually becomes so strikingly apparent as to constitute him the object of His tenderest regard.

No one will charge that God is *unable* to discern His individual creatures on account of any limitation of His Wisdom. That were to curtail His attribute of Omniscience. It were necessary to hold, then, that any ignoring of man's being and history must result from an *intentional oversight* or indifference. But is such a thought at all tenable? Man, to be sure, possesses the humiliating privilege of knowing alone what he wishes to retain, or of not knowing that which he may not choose to remember, since he holds but that which his senses convey to his mind. But what vail may we imagine to shield His creatures from the all-seeing eye of the Creator? In what remote region might God locate His throne, so as to exclude His creature-domain from His vision? Would He voluntarily disrobe Himself of the attribute of Omniscience? If so, were He still Omnipresent and Infinite? Is it conceivable for God to lay aside but one attribute, however partially, without surrendering all, at the same time? Then, too, may we think of Infinity apart from Space, or of Space apart from itself. Cicero laments the fact that Homer did not portray the perfections of the gods to mankind, rather than clothe them in the passions of man. Yet what

have we more under the Deistical view than a Homeric god, who nods on Mount Ida, and forgets the lot of his Trojans? It may be mooted as a ground why God should ignore the transitions of His handiwork, because such individualities were trivialities, and wholly unworthy of the notice of the Infinite Mind. To mortals such an allegation has force. To us many things are too minute and trifling to notice and remember. Man is obliged to content himself with glittering generalities in order that he may embrace the all in the whole. And he would fain flatter himself that such a prerogative is some proof of large-mindedness.

Yet, how can we conceive of the Spirit of Absolute Omniscience and Omnipresence, as discerning the whole, apart from its parts? May the general confront His mind without a discernment of particulars also? A grain of sand is as actually present in space as a mountain. Only on the silly assumption, that the Infinite Spirit is obliged to enumerate separate items *seriatim*, after the manner of finite beings, which must be subsequently woven into warp and woof, can such a thought become tolerable. Paradoxical as it is, yet it is absolutely necessary, first of all to belittle the Creator, ere we can sufficiently exalt Him, and render Him so lofty as to sink mankind into an abyss of oblivion.

Nor dare one so much as to ask, On what account shall we deem God's realm of Creation of too small moment for His recognition? Verily, we are told, that such a constant concern for endless details illy comports with one's notion of Infinitude of Character; that such a Deity as alone satisfies the mind, must, once for all, and amply, have provided for the preservation and perfection of the Universe with all its denizens, through the wise founding and constituting of Universal Laws; and that therefore the special government and care of its individual parts are wholly superfluous. The artist, after having constructed his horoscope perfectly, would but interfere with his mechanism's functions, or at the best perform gratuitous work, were he continually to concern himself with every separate

wheel and lever." Here we touch the crucial point in the discussion; and it behooves us to be severely attentive. Just here lies the whole ground of misunderstanding between the Theist and the Deist. Let us see whether the dispute is not about terms, rather than truths, or whether the apple of contention is worth the contention.

We assume that the Creator governs the Universe through the Laws of Nature, as common ground. But are individual creatures therefore excluded from the Vision of His wise Providence? Could not all and each, consequently, be present in His Infinite Mind? At the era of the establishment of these ordinances, did not His Wisdom and Benevolence embrace them also? Here an issue may be raised. The Deist conceives of a God who is too lofty to deign to know and care for the individual creature, either in his origin or through its history and destiny. And to him all theories and speculations concerning a general or special Providence, are but a pious fancy. The Theist, on the other hand, congratulates himself in holding a ground on which the doctrine and creed of an amiable and adorable Providence rests, to his unutterable consolation. It is to him a precious thought that the Creator should have discerned and recognized all the creatures of His hand, already at the genesis of these Universal Laws, and as vividly, indeed, as to preclude every possibility of being ever ignored.

Only a knowledge of God's Being and of the Universe itself can afford us sufficient light to decide the question. These may be considered as tribunals to which all inquiry must be carried with any hope of securing a satisfactory verdict.

We may formulate our statement in an interrogative manner, *videlicet*,—Did the Creator, after having endowed the mechanism of the Universe with the Laws of Nature, exile His creatures beyond the vision of His Infinite Mind?

This is a privilege which an artizan may embrace. He may well banish the labor of his brain and hand from his memory after its consummation. But we are forced to ask

again, Whither, in the ocean of Infinite Space, may we imagine the Creator to withdraw, or project His finished Universe, that His Omnipresence and Omniscience may no more discern it? How may we imagine an Omnipresent Being *not* to be present everywhere? or to be absent anywhere? Can we, perhaps, portray the mind of God in the light of a mirror, in which His Creation might have been mechanically reflected for a time, and which subsequently faded out? In this view we are compelled to rob God of the attribute of Consciousness, even as we were, under the former supposition, obliged to deny Him Infinity. Under either assumption all discussion concerning an Intelligent Creator sinks into a mere logomachy.

Furthermore, the Laws of Nature emanate, in some subtle manner, out of the various individual objects and subjects which they, in turn, govern and uphold. But why speak any longer of ignoring these separate parts or trivial individualities when they themselves constitute the very springs of those Universal Laws, and constantly animate and fructify them? Why make so much of those laws or forces *in their totality*; and so little of them *in their separateness*? Can we consistently magnify and well-nigh worship the totality, and utterly ignore its contingencies? Is it conceivable for an artist to be assured of the efficiency of his mechanism without possessing an acquaintance and familiarity, even, with all its minutest parts and their exact functions, as well as with their mutual relations? Either God did or did not assign a definite measure of self-efficiency to the sum total of Nature's Laws at their ordination, by whose efficiency Nature, with all its species, exist. If not how could even God's prescience, to speak after the manner of men, be assured in advance of their potencies. And if such an assignment had been allotted, how might God *not* have known their functions already at the dawn of their founding. It certainly lay within the province of the Creator to establish Universal Laws. He established the Law of Gravity, for example, and impressed upon matter a tendency towards the earth's centre, accord-

ing to the measure of its inner mass. So, too, did He endow creatures with the *nisus* of propagation. But such laws are not yet a Universe.

A number of untamed steeds, charged with spiritedness and brute power, do not constitute a team. The Law of Electricity, though ever in force from the beginning, did yet not afford telegraphy to society. An *adjustment of forces* is necessary ere a Science or Art results. The term UNIVERSE implies, not only laws, but a correlation of laws also—a *turning of all about a pivotal one*. In this fact lies the miracle of the Kosmos. Were this unity wanting amid the community of laws, all were still a chaos. No one imagines God to marshall the Heavenly Hosts by His personal arm, each and all; it is through the Law of Gravity, by which His infinite wisdom conducts planets and comets along their tracks in such harmonious succession as never to allow them to stray or collide, however their several courses may intersect. In like manner are all Nature's Laws *media* of the Creator. But how might even the Creator have assigned a path to Mercury or to Saturn, let us reverently ask, without having previously weighed, as in a balance, to speak after the manner of men—their particles of matter, as well as correlated their primary impulses of motion with each other, and with all the other spheres? In what conceivable manner could the Creator have so accurately and infallibly anticipated the gravities of the wandering stars in their erratic courses, without, at the same time, also surveying, as by a *Divine perspective*, every inch of their extended orbits, their several and mutual distances, already in the morning of their virgin creation to the end of their existences?

As little is God's Omnipotence directly employed in the germination, growth and perpetuation of the vegetable species, or animals. Such a theory would verily belittle God's character. By means of special and relative laws, in these vast realms, the Omniscience of the Creator could infallibly know the natures, elements, sustenances and manners of propagation, as well as the relation of every single creature and their harmony with Na-

ture's whole. Amid all the inevitable changes in the earth, God is never compelled to supplement those primal Forces of Nature by any additional acts of Creation, or to repair the damages which time and change must constantly effect by means of a personal interference. A flood, an army of grasshoppers, an unfavorable season, or a contagious epidemic may blight our fields, crops and herds. Nevertheless a balance is ever preserved between such factitious calamities and the earth's treasure-trove—between “the seven years of plenty and the seven years of famine.” Such a general graduation of the grand whole has been established, through His prescience of Nature's Laws in all their relations, as that never a *Universal* famine could prevail. A failure of crops in one direction has always been commensurated by a bountifulness in another, and the normal value of the “staff of life” has never suffered, nor has the necessary zeal and ambition of mankind ever died away in toiling for “daily bread,” since the era in which the “Lord remembered Noah.”

What mind may properly fathom the wisdom of Nature's Laws? Who tries to sound the depth of such an economy? But who can think of such a law-endowed realm,—apart from a Providential Aegis, extending over all its apartments? And again, what mind can forego the thought that the founding of such far-reaching and fixed ordinances of Nature involves also an intuitive glance, at least, of the Universe in its entirety, at its genesis?—the measure of fertility in every species, their peculiar natures and modes of propagation, their fortuitous changes, the histories and destinies of all creatures—inanimate and organic? To escape the part of a *Universal* Providence by deifying the Laws of Nature, as it were, we gain nothing, but lose much. We oblige ourselves to bow down and worship a community of *Forces*, instead of a *Personal Creator*. The singular phenomenon, that every species of creatures possesses its peculiar manner of propagation, argues in behalf of a special Providence of a high order. Since the Laws of Nature are in every case exactly adapted to the peculiar conditions of

all beings—to their modes and measures of reproduction, their structures, their several elements, their sustentation, their offensive and defensive weapons, and to their relations to Nature at large, it is impossible for men to conceive of an economy in which so perfect a system of adaptation prevails, apart from the assumption also that a plan, embracing all these adjustments, must have confronted the Infinite Mind at Nature's origin. And the nearer we approach the human species the more difficult is the solution, apart from a special Providence. Montesquieu affirms that "the multiplying *nisus* is, in all animal races, the same, for the reason that the same measure of instinct infills them." But where may we look for a mechanism in which so general a law of reproduction can be explained by such a theory? Law which unalterably fixes the relation between males and females among all the animal races? And though we accept the proffered explanation, so far as it pertains to animals, what scientist would hazard its adoption, when applied to the Human Race? Here we enter upon a theatre in which the environments, thoughts, passions and a thousand other motives become active and exert their manifold influences, all of which militate against so meager a rule by which to solve the problem of reproduction. If ever a structure was made to appear unsafe by placing a pyramid upon its apex, the Montesquieu solution may indeed be considered top-heavy.

The various theories of Evolution, and the most subtle philosophies of Natural Laws fail us in shedding the desired light. We are shut in to the necessity of either accepting the grand scheme of Nature as the fortuitous out-come of stone-blind chance, or of admitting that the Universe, with all its departments and details—as well as in all imaginable or possible relations—must have confronted the Divine Mind simultaneously with the enactment of Nature's ordinances, by which, as through His own hands, God created and maintains His Universe of Worlds. Hence it is that men speak of the strong *arms* of the law, even in Caesar's realm. Because of the institution of such instinctive *media*, the Creator need not, from time to time, de-

scend from His throne to provide for every emergency. All things are eternally present in the mind of God, and it was by a Divine Intuition that Omniscience and Omnipotence elected the Order of Nature, and maintain it, from the beginning to the end of time.

Needy, short-sighted and finite mortals must resort to temporary and occasional enactments as the best "under the circumstances," and await their uncertain operations. In the light of such vague and even fallible methods, man ventures on the task of constructing mechanisms or microcosms. But God has His ways, as well as His hours. "God's ways are not our ways" is a maxim as scientific as it is a saintly saying.

The maintenance and order of the Universe, however, do not depend wholly or exclusively on the immanent efficiency of the Creator's institutions or laws. It is in the correlations, or mutual co-operations that their unique perfections lie. The realm of Nature is more than a vast net-work of canons, alive with energies and powers, of exactest advancement even. The *Esprit de Corps* renders the chaos a Kosmos, we say. All things move, but all things move with a due deference to all other things. The disturbance in a part affects the whole. An accident, pure and simple, an isolated event, which may not be traced to an antecedent, were wholly inconceivable—an anomaly in Nature. The continuity of Cause and Effect cannot be broken. Antecedent and Consequent reach up and down through the chain entire, from beginning to end. It is just as impossible for an object to become extinct, as it is impossible for something to come from nothing. Nature has no room for chasms or for surprises.

Notwithstanding, there is room for as many and various degrees of perfection to exist as there are possibilities of readjustments of parts, or dissolutions or recombinations, to transpire. And the proportion of perfection in each and every individual part, from which that of the whole arises, is ever and necessarily of as high a degree, or as choice, as the general completeness will allow. The order of the whole constantly metes and

governs the fulness of the individual. What clashings and imperfections must inevitably follow in the wake of a Providence which were satisfied to know only orders and species—the genera—and remained blind to the constituents and their particular adjustments! What is a Providence of Species? The Infinite mind does not discern according to section, order or class. These are only crutches by which mortal and finite beings limp their way along. Because their understanding is too narrowly circumscribed to realize and individualize all things simultaneously and with distinctness, men arrange and group objects which possess certain common characteristics, under general heads, the more easily to comprehend and distinguish these from those. This is what we mean by Classification. Were man's capacities still more limited, such classes and orders were correspondingly enlarged too. The blind man widens his cycles of knowledge, as well as all those who are deprived of the average number of senses. A snail, could it think at all, must necessarily group Nature under a single head. The father of a family does not resort to a classification, since its inmates are like near to him. But in the measure in which numbers transcends man's comprehension, is he obliged to resort to a more general and more vague method of representation. When we speak of our fellow-citizens, for example, we have in mind a certain number of voters who belong to the Commonwealth, and extending our conception over several States, which a General Government embraces, we think of a Republic, a Kingdom or an Empire of inhabitants. These, again, constitute Human Society in the Race and World. Yet in the last extension have we but a map or atlas of the globe before the mind. Finally, our capacity is exhausted, as it were, and, like the school-boy, we embrace whole systems of worlds under the imaginary picture of a Scorpion or Ursa Major.

But shall we, for a moment, think that the Infinite Spirit gathers knowledge after a like approximating method? To such a Mind every individual creature is necessarily and immediately present, with all its peculiarities, and with all the charac-

teristics and conditions which constitute it a separate and specific being, as well as arrayed in those garments which make it a link in the long chain of existences. The influence which every creature exerts on its surroundings, by virtue of its normal condition, is not, in any sense, one and the same with the external likeness or similarity by which the naturalist arranges it in his cabinet or catalogue. In Nature every creature occupies its own niche, exerts its specific influence, which renders it, accordingly, as peculiar in its environments as if it had belonged to an entirely different species. In the concatenation, every creature is *sui generis*, in a sense, and never one with or like to any other. Each acts for itself and not in a common groove. The effects of each and all are specific in consequences and in similarities, notwithstanding their general intermingling. In a mechanism, any legitimate movements on the part of the least portion of it, presupposes a proper adjustment throughout. The same may be predicated of Nature's mechanism. Every grain of sand stands for a wheel; the position of the larger objects is also conditioned by the position of the smaller. Even the Moral Order borders close on the physical. But for a pack of chattering geese in the capital, there might have been no such Rome, or such a Cæsar. The friction of the ocean, which crumbles the ice along the northern coasts is caused by a storm which wrecks a fleet in some far-distant sea; the ice may be handled by a lad, who tosses it into the hand of a naturalist, where it may prove an occasion to important discoveries to mankind. How close did an apple verge in a correct conception of the Solar System!

Yet the Creator of the universe knew all; He must necessarily have known all, in sun-light clearness, already in the beginning of things—unless the Infinite Mind were unconscious or dead to issues, or arrives at facts by piece-meal steps, and only after the consummation of events. It were then but mockery to persist in calling God a Creator; Creation and Providence were words without meaning; and the amazing order and harmony in Nature, which survives all disturb-

ances and discords, and issues into yet higher harmonies, were like some grand melody produced in perfect accord with the exactest laws of acoustics, but regardless and independent of the diatonic scale.

It will be conceded, surely, that Infinite Wisdom and Benevolence must necessarily order the Universe in all its departments and details after as complete and perfect a manner as the plan of creation permitted or required. Such a wise and kindly motive and disposition in the Creator must likewise have embraced the welfare of the Human Race as a chief and dominant factor. Mankind could not but be a subject of favorite regard and solicitude. In the domain of organic Nature, considered apart, all the members of the countless species and classes ever remain faithful to their primeval types. In the Moral Order, however, there is room and liberty for endless deviations and varieties of higher or lower degrees of perfection, in consequence of far more various surroundings, which naturally affect its members in ever different manners and measures. While, on the Physical plane, all are bound and controlled by fixed and unalterable laws and instincts, in the Moral sphere, individual and arbitrary motives come into play, and capricious ends are set. Hence it is, that in the former theatre every order reaches its ultimate goal of perfection simultaneously with its temporary period of existence. In the latter realm the happiness or misery of every man may be of an infinitely higher or lower degree, because of the manifoldness of conditions. We cannot speak any longer in the same sense of Universal Sovereign Laws reigning with exact rigidity in this domain, and fixing the precise degrees and measures of completeness in every case. If we are unwilling, accordingly, to concede a special Providence governing the Moral spheres, which recognizes and provides for every individual being, we have no other alternative but to affirm that all the perfections, partial perfections and imperfections are matters of utter indifference to their Maker; that He held mankind alone as unworthy of His Providence; and that He consequently left the Human

Race to the sport of Chance. So licentious a thought, when fully stated, means that a Being of Infinite Power, Wisdom and Benevolence created a race of beings, endowing them with Reason, Understanding and Moral Sense—the nearest akin to Himself—for whose welfare or misery He is yet wholly unconcerned; and of whose destiny He is quite indifferent. But a God who confessedly cares for the sparrow and the lily will likely, too, have a kindly eye on His masterpiece, which is capable of so lofty a height, as well as of so deep a degeneration.

It will furthermore be conceded that the Human Race is more thoroughly assured of attaining to its ultimate happiness if such an order of Divine Providence actually prevails over its history, relations and conduct. Nor will it be alleged that the Creator *could not institute* such a comprehensive Providence. We must, then, believe that God really refrained from ordering and maintaining such an economy from a love of ease, or an apprehension of incurring too great a load of toil. But this were a conclusion so humiliating and derogatory to God's character as to warrant its prompt dismissal. It cannot be dreamed that His attributes of Greatness and Goodness would permit Him to refrain from acting in full harmony with His Perfection. How can men conceive of the Infinite Creator, then, who rendered unconscious matter, even a mirror, adumbrative of much of His Majesty; of a Father, the Wisest and Best, who is concerned for the welfare of His tiniest insect, as yet so callous and so haughty as to exclude mankind from His Providence? A Race, too, for whose ultimate benefit all the lower orders of the universe are so manifestly adjusted, and which He exclusively endowed with such sublime prerogatives as render its members capable of intelligently inferring His glorious Attributes; of daily realizing His Wisdom and Goodness in every flying insect! That He should only have excepted a Race which alone is capable of appreciating His Providence, were a most perplexing riddle. To suppose that such an exception were from a motive of slothfulness, were blasphemy.

Rather by far let men commit the violence against their better nature, and deny all proofs of His Being, than accept a God with the nature of an iceberg. That were, to say the most, not blasphemy against His high and holy nature.

It is true, mankind remains a perennial phenomenon, and might be so viewed, apart from a belief in a reigning Providence. But whilst this were enough consolation for an Insect tribe, it were not sufficiently consoling to an order of beings endowed with Understanding and Moral Perception, to think that their propagating and digestive organs remained in a normally working state. It were but a poor solace to be assured, that a Creator who counts the fallen dust of every flower, and provides for the maturity of the minutest ephemera, should be content with caring only so far for Mankind as not to suffer its extinction. Men and mullein-stalks were then on a *par*!

Man well knows his insignificance when he stands by an ancient pyramid. But when he once sees himself as the "offspring of God;" endowed with Intelligence and Moral Perception; as the connecting-link with God in the long chain of Creation—then, he ceases to deprecate his individual nothingness, and begins rather to wonder over the fearfulness and solemnity of his being and position. Every point in his history assumes a significance; all his acts and changes are dressed in a robe of accountability, as they must appear in the eye of his Maker too, since all indwelled in His Mind in the genesis of all things, and stand noted in a book, to be made manifest in letters, which may be read while running, and understood by the simple. God is great in minuteness, as in magnitude, since the same hand that has fitted up the legs of a fly with all the properties of an air-pump, has also created the Suns of other Systems, and placed them so far away that their light only reaches us after millions of years.

A chain remains what it is, wherever the individual links may be placed in the series; but we have, in this case, something more than unconscious links; a series of relations confronts us, maintained by efficient powers, which are countless

in members. One act is pregnant with a thousand occasions to many other acts, whose immediate and successive effects may remain unknown to man, but can still never be annihilated. The Infinite Mind traces their sequences down to Eternity. The virtuous man may see good ground for his zeal and heroism to rest on, in this fact; zeal and heroism in the interest of right and truth, and his endurance of self-denial, and renunciation of the world, even to the spurning of a crown. A motive is thus suggested to the humble soul, to remain faithful in that which is least even, no less than in great trusts; to set store by the smallest moral act also. Though it may be of so trivial a nature that Mortal eye cannot discern it and its direct effects; yet an earnest word spoken in defense of Truth and Virtue; a sincere and disinterested act performed in behalf of Innocence; a cup of cold water given to soothe a burning brow; a trifle done in aid of the oppressed and suffering; a cheering smile or kindly look bestowed on an orphan; the slightest encouragement to promptness and diligence—to all these acts a motive is afforded. The actor dies; nor is the act recorded in the Public Records: yet are their immediate effects merged in countless successive combinations, until the last grand results appear, it may be, centuries later, in a far-off region, where no eye can penetrate or retrace it to its far remote antecedent. Still, the Infinite Mind of the Creator had never for a moment lost sight of it.

And just as broad is the ground for anxiety and apprehension too. A sense of responsibility haunts him who slights the least occasion to foster Truth and Right, be it through pride, selfishness or indifference. There is a cause adduced for alarm and remorse to all who detract from Justice and Righteousness, in the eyes of the simple and wavering, through frivolity or malice, in conversation or conduct. The terror of death may well seize on him who sports with wrong; who commits crimes in cold blood; who glories in his shame; who lives in the service of evil; who robs society of its moral foundations; or who entices others to slay the Truth. The transgressor dies, and

is long forgotten. But his wrongs remain; their sad effects continue to fruit in yet other and largely multiplied crimes; their poison does not exhaust itself or lose its malignity, but spreads out in other minds; yea, in the evening of Time, it may still be alive and fatal. And no one can affirm that the primal spring became lost to the Infinite One. Death has not exonerated the criminal, as little as it has removed him from God's eye. If it be possible for a wrong-doer to escape from the Mind of the Creator, in the face of such relations with his fellows, then might man also escape from himself, and there were, indeed, no God.

We have recounted some of the principal reasons, by which the Theist upholds his Creed in a Divine Providence. It roots itself deep and wide in the essential Omnipresence of his God; in His inseparable attributes of Wisdom and Benevolence; in every correct conception of an Intelligent Creation; in the ever-efficient Candor and Perfection pervading the vast domain of Nature. So broad and deeply-laid are its corner-stones.

Meanwhile, in upholding the doctrine of a Divine Providence, the Theist does not believe in departures from the ordained order of the Universe, once for all; in extinctions of any one of the primal Laws; in miraculous interventions; in alterations of the eternally proclaimed decrees. Such a regime of "special" Providence were derogatory to the Divine Being. The Theist and the Deist are here again as one. And why should it not be, that both should be moved by a like veneration for his boundless Wisdom, and cherish an equally exalted opinion of the Supreme Being? All clear light shed over the region of Deism is but reflected light from the plane of Theism. The Theist is assured, that his personal existence and destiny are embraced in the Ground Plan of the Universe. And in this conviction, that the Infinite, Wise and Good Being, as the Creator must be conceded to be, has surely ordered the relations of all things with a wise eye to the highest good of every single creature, after the measure of their several capacities and relations to all, he realizes, furthermore, the gratifying

consolation, that *he too* must have confronted the Divine Mind eternally; and that from the Epoch, in which the Plan of the Universe had been Divinely decreed, the Creator must likewise have elected such a history of relations for Himself, as He, in His Eternal Wisdom and Love, deemed the wisest and the best.

The Creed of the Theist, concerning a special Providence, is simple, reasonable and consoling. He believes that God discerns mankind in Love; that He discerns human motives and conduct; that man's station, relations, vicissitudes and destinies are no surprises to God, but were all provided for, in His Infinite Wisdom and Charity; that, whilst his weaknesses and fatalities are not ordained, they are anticipated and overruled and turned into occasions of far higher good, according to every one's capacity; that man's Maker did not enrich him with such lofty endowments as to elevate him above all other creatures of His kind, to neglect him subsequently—still less, to render him more miserable; but, that He must have ordained just such relations and occasions, for his ultimate happiness and perfection;—In a word! The Doctrine of a Special Providence teaches, that the Creator knows and loves mankind, ever and always, because of His Omniscience and Eternal Charity.

Whatever mystery may enshroud the dogma, beyond its plain statement, is owing to the meagerness of human speech. Man is ever prone to confound God's Intuitional Knowledge with human *fore-knowledge*; or, in other words, we make a distinction between God's Science and God's Prescience, as we speak of man's ability to know and to *fore-know*: yet in God's mind there can be no such a distinction made. The Infinite Being does not acquire wisdom and knowledge by successive steps; there can be no loitering deliberation, no repealing of conclusions by reflection. All is as one intuitive glance. By virtue of such a vision, God must have instantaneously realized, from Eternity to Eternity, all His creatures; mankind in its totality, with all the individual changes, which make the history of the Race too, through all Eons, down to Time's end.

In that Primeval Divine Glance was determined Creation; the Universe of Worlds; every sphere with its Creatures; Mankind. Then was fixed the point of beginning for all things; man's epoch; his position and relation; his capacities, and the utmost bounds of their exercise; his moral freedom, with its unique limitation, which will never allow mortals to so abuse the Will, as to result in a Surplus-Evil in Time, but only so far as to eventuate in ultimate and higher good. In the Intuitive Divine Vision one class was fitted for the plow, another for the sword, a third for the throne—whether each class followed the call or not. Then the adaptations for palace and hovel were adjusted; the ocean's shores and the hero's power and prestige—all in Infinite Wisdom. Then were the talents and powers bestowed, for the weal of the masses, to the Antonii and the Trajans; as well as, for scourges to a people enervated by luxury and vice, to the Domitians. Then were discerned the epochs and periods, where righteousness and temperance should exalt a people, as well as those eras in which sin and revelry should sink others under the earth, as a warning to still others on the way. Then were grades contemplated, vocations fixed, degrees of hope and trials weighed, as in the nicest balances; and the doors to happiness or misery hung on their hinges, to be pushed ajar, as His free creature would. Then were discerned, as in the sun's full blaze, the motives of the wrong-doer, who heaps up his ill-gotten gains; and of the philanthropist's anxiety to dispense with generous hand in acts of charity; then it was seen, when merit must go unrewarded, in many instances, and when vice would stalk abroad with a high head; when virtue must temporarily succumb; when Right should be slain in a Baptist's dungeon, and lewdness lie in a Herod's palace on a bed of down. Then was fixed in the conscience of man the mysterious signal, which never fails to warn at the approach of wrong, even under the most promising garb, nor neglects to utter words of good cheer in every effort of integrity, no matter how heavy the cross that must be borne. And of all the characteristics which

the Creator impressed upon all the creatures of His hand, in His Beatific Glance, there remains none to mention, which more constantly and loudly declares the fact, that He is ever yet the watchful Governor of His Universe, in all its history in Time, than the still small voice of His Spirit, which no power can hush from saying, "THOU SHALT!" "THOU SHALT NOT!" Hence, the worst man never committed a bad action without some compunction, nor a good one, without some delight.

Yet were not the Freedom and Happiness of Mankind in the least degree forestalled, by the fact, that the Creator did discern and provide for all things simultaneously with the genesis of the Universe and its myriads of beings. How might His creatures in any wise suffer injury or loss, in consequence of God having anticipated and made provision for all things arising, when His sole motive is grounded in Infinite Love? Such a misleading thought can only be cherished from the false supposition, that man might fall heir to a still larger share of liberty and felicity, in case God were only now to issue his decrees, or, that he must necessarily enjoy less freedom of action and greater limitations, under such a Prescience of the Creator. Man's *usus loquendi* is ever in correspondence with his limited apprehension of knowledge. A certain measure of uncertainty always attaches to *his* fore-knowledge; in every human anticipation a cloud of vagueness and doubt impends, because he cannot with absolute certitude foresee all the factitious changes which may transpire. In the mind of God, however, Science is Prescience; and to know is to anticipate emergencies also. All Science is *Fiat-Science* in the Eternal Mind. Whether, therefore, the Creator were but now to discern, and determine on governing the relations and fitness of all things, according to the spontaneous suggestions of His Infinite Wisdom and Love, or had so done from Eternity, His Providence were not in the least differently affected. In both instances all were still as it is.

But why should not God also order and determine simulta-

neously with His discerning? Why should such a Being not at the same time ordain, that which He must necessarily know, in virtue of His Omniscience? Why should He recognize events and relations, from Everlasting to Everlasting, and yet postpone decreeing to some future epoch? We were; under such procedure, obliged to assume that God's mind had not been thoroughly active or fully conscious, at the era of Creation, of all the capacities and their efficiencies, which yet emanated from His hand, and that He had formed free beings, without also fathoming the depth of their motives in all directions.

Let men conceive of a Divine Providence in whatever light they please, such an economy still remains most rational and consoling to mankind. The Infinite Being must have discerned man—his spirit and conduct—his capacities, inclinations and relations, from Eternity; and so must He still know him, being the unchangeably Omniscient God. God must have been solicitous for mankind too, from Eternity, and must ever be, since He is Infinite Love. Having embraced the nature and history of the Race, in His vision, and being essentially Love, it follows that God's Providence cannot cease to be eternally active, without in the least infringing on man's moral freedom and personal peace.

Man's own Conscience can alone cause him anxiety. And should he also feel at ease in this direction, he may serenely await all future developments. If even the Earth were to pass away, he may still hope for a higher and later economy to supervene its ruins, with unmistakable confidence.

We have said that the Creator, as a universal Father, could as amply care for the good of all and the happiness of each one by discerning and ordaining all things simultaneously with the genesis of the world, as He would have provided for all, did He interfere and arrange for emergencies as they transpire. Yet, under the latter assumption—which has been styled the "Carpenter" method—His Providence must strike us as of a scant and meagre order, indeed. Man must first be inflamed by a

species of jealousy, because God did not choose to subordinate the highest good of all to one's own personal selfishness, in His Universal Plan, and

"All this dread Order break! For whom? For thee,
Vile worm! O Madness! Pride! Vanity!"

Man is never happier than when he enjoys that measure of peace which comports best with the normal bliss of the universal whole. The individual's cup may be said to be as full as Infinite Wisdom and Benevolence can supply it. In this view, the history of the world becomes a sacred and divine order. The least event becomes clothed with significance and importance, since Supreme Intelligence must have determined the plan which embraced the highest good for all after an infallible scale. The affairs of every man, accordingly, wear a grave aspect; his position on the world's theatre; the occurrences in his history, all is correlated to the welfare of the whole by the wise and kindly hand of his Maker. It is literally true, then, that "the hairs on his head are numbered, and that not one can fall without His notice." All room for accidents, which might disturb the universal plan, is closed, since we cannot conceive of any surprises befalling Supreme and Infinite Intelligence.

Neither is there a door open by which Fate may invade the plane of God's Providence. Amid all the conditions and occasions which are provided for, Certainty is still assured. But never and nowhere can an iron Necessity drag man violently and involuntarily on. That were only possible, in case God had fixed upon a world-plan regardless of man's free will, and subsequently woven his history in the universal warp and woof; or, the Creator had determined His Absolute Decrees over mankind, without including man's relations therein. But Fate no more overhangs human relations, in the economy of God's Providence, than were man and his history to be but now recognized and assigned, by God's Wisdom, Justice and Love, since all these relations are only adjusted with an eye on the choice which his free will was known to make. His duty to

labor, and his obligation to obey the dictates of enlightened Reason, as little cease to bind man, as God's proffered Grace becomes either ineffectual or superfluous.

Nor are the Prayers of mankind to be regarded as an unmeaning and idle exercise. Mere acts of devotion play the same part, under the Providential Economy of God, as they must, were we to assume that God did but now and from time to time recognize mankind and its wants.

- a) Prayer is not designed to remind the Creator of man's actual existence, amid the myriads of beings. His eye discerned him ere he was born.
- b) Prayer is not engaged in to set man's needs and weaknesses more vividly before the mind of God. All these were and are better known to the Creator than they are to the creature.
- c) Prayer is not an expedient, by which relief measures may be suggested to God. That were impertinence.
- d) Prayer is not resorted to, thereby to excite God's mind to acts of Love and Mercy. "God is Love."
- e) Prayer is no device, by which man would provoke the Creator to depart from His Plan, and perform miraculous works. God cannot transgress His own Laws, in behalf of man's selfish and short-sighted interests.
- f) Prayer implies a power and willingness on the part of God to adapt the efficiency of His Laws to the good of His creatures as often as mortals render their natures appreciative of such accommodations.

There is not the remotest thought, either of a contradiction, or annihilation of a single Natural Law, in the soul of a sincere believer. Yet man may not deny to the Creator the power and privilege of checking and directing the energy of His own Laws, whenever Infinite Wisdom and Love deem it best. Else were God the subject and servant of His own Ordinances. The artist reserves the right of controlling his master-piece. The artizan reserves the power of setting in motion and at rest, his own mechanism. It were a calamity, could an engineer not

increase, decrease, and hold entirely at bay, the velocity of his own instrument. Man may, in many instances, temporarily neutralize the Law of Gravity, or the tendency in water to seek its own level. Yet, in such cases, no one thinks of annihilating or contradicting the Laws of Nature. Why may we not, then, consistently accord a similar prerogative to the Creator?

A flood or a conflagration threatens the husbandman's fields or homestead. Neither can be thought of as a surprise to the Creator. He must have discerned them, prior to their incipency. Were there no ulterior ends to be reached by God's great World-Plan, than the preservation of personal effects, or even of human life, nothing, surely, were easier for Omnipotence than to turn the channels of such calamities, or even to forestall them entirely. Nor is it absurd for man, who sees not beyond his own safety, to cry to God. Knowing, however, that God's World-Plan far transcends the mere mundane purpose of securing perishable and temporal goods and chattels, and even the nobler end of adding a further lease to individual existence, man commits himself the closer to God, whether it be for preservation after his way, or God's. And assuming that this world looks to yet others, the discipline which such calamities and their exercise effect, is not wholly lost, whether his prayer is heard after his interpretation, or after God's higher rendering. Having prayed, in view of the Hereafter, man may possess his soul in patience, amid the saddest results, when his fresh paroxysms of grief have allayed themselves.

In no event does the theist regard Prayer as a subterfuge, or as a vain compliment to God. He trusts the *ultimatum* of Divine Decrees, which is not yet manifest to his mind. Hence Prayer is a filial committal of himself to God's Eternal Wisdom and Love—a means by which man would become more loyal to God—an act which we may only believe to be regarded by God with stone-like stoicism, when we can once persuade ourselves that Love and ice are homogeneous!

The creed in Divine Providence does not exonerate man from maintaining his legitimate relation and pious attitude to his

Creator. His spirit, life and history, as well as his destiny, will take complexion from the manner in which he exercises his Free Will in harmony with, or in opposition to God's Will. Knowing that God has not rigidly fixed an iron-clad or unconditional decree over mankind, he knows, too, that he should stand to God with folded hands, and bowed head, as the Infinite Source of every good and perfect gift. He dreads to grieve Him by an antagonistic attitude towards Himself or His Laws, and thereby forfeit the influx of benediction, by so placing himself and life beyond His outspread wings. His theistic instinct forever challenges a healthy human spirit to heed the obligation—**WORSHIP GOD!** Prayer to God is like the good subject's renewal of Loyalty to his King.

It may be thought, that as the Omniscient Being must inevitably have ordained the very best economy for mankind, man is exonerated from the duty of supplicating His mercy. But that were to say, that an Infinitely Just and Holy Being would establish an order for His moral creatures, which would work in a sheer mechanical way, and, *volens volens*, perfect their natures, regardless of their attitude, conduct and relation to Himself and His just Laws. And that were Fatalism.

Or, again, if, from a sense of humility and reverence towards God's Wisdom and Benevolence, man felt too timid to obtrude his short-sighted desires, and preferred to surrender himself solely and implicitly to His unchangeable and good Will, *such a Faith were itself already an order of Prayer unexpressed in words*. But how may we conceive of so child-like a truth to indwell man's soul in any vivid manner, without, at the same time, finding vent? Such soul-stirrings only remain alive and healthy, by overflowing in Thanksgiving, Praise, Supplication, Petition, Intercession, and Confession.

The criticism, frequently made, that man's Prayers are not always, or seldom, answered, does not in the least unnerve the Theist. The desire to have Prayers "answered," is but the superficial ebullition—the paroxysmal overflow—of man's sensual weakness. The key-note of every genuine Prayer is,

that the soul may be brought in such a normal relation to God, as to enable Him to have His good and holy Will done in itself. No one expects to be "*heard*," if by Prayer be meant the setting up of man's poor wish against the Will of the Eternal. And this ought to close the question of man's prayers not being "*heard*," or "*granted*."

But this is not the whole question. "For, on the other hand, Prayer is and remains always a native and deepest impulse of the soul of man; and, correctly gone about, is of the very highest benefit (nay, one might say, indispensability) to every man aiming morally high in this world. No prayer, no *Religion*, or at least only a *dumb* and lamed one. Prayer is a turning of one's soul, in heroic reverence, in infinite desire and endeavor, towards the Highest, the All-Excellent, Omnipotent, Supreme. The modern Hero, therefore, ought *not* to give up praying, as he has latterly all but done."

"Words of Prayer, in this epoch, I know hardly any. But the act of prayer, in great moments, I believe to be still possible; and that one should gratefully accept such moments, and count them blest, when they come, if come they do—which latter is a most rigorous preliminary question with us in all cases? '*Can I pray in this moment*' (much as I may *wish* to do so)? 'If not, then NO!' I can at least stand silent, inquiring, and *not* blasphemously *lie* in this Presence! On the whole, Silence is the one safe form of prayer known to me, in this poor sordid era—though there are ejaculatory words too which occasionally rise on one, with a felt propriety and veracity; words very welcome in such case! Prayer is the aspiration of our poor struggling heavy-laden soul towards its Eternal Father; and with or without words, ought *not* to become impossible, nor, I persuade myself, need it ever. Loyal sons and subjects *can* approach the King's throne who have no request to make there, except that they may continue loyal. Cannot they? . . . Silence, Silence! 'The Highest cannot be spoken of in words,' says Goethe. Nothing so desecrates mankind as

their continual babbling, both about the speakable and the unspeakable, in this bad time!"

Thus far we have left CARLYLE speak in his own rugged way, not so much to endorse his view, as to show, that there are other benefits to be derived from the exercise of prayer, beyond the *answers* looked for. That Prayer is a nobler art than that of an everlasting "begging."

The Theist does not stand in waiting on Miracles, to interrupt the course of events, which is, in his mind, the conduct of human affairs at the hand of Providence. He knows, that if such wonders stood ready at the call of his prayers, and Omnipotence were at his service even, mankind were not as happy, by far, as the economy of Infinite Wisdom renders it. Verily, his comfort arises in no wise from a hope of breaking the Divine Order, and of turning all things into his partial and selfish groove. But this is his consolation, that his self-surrender is enhanced, the conviction of being the subject of Divine notice is deepened, a more intimate moral communion established, and a consequent larger influx of Grace is obtained. His daily life appears to his eye, as a "Diary" of Providence. Under no conception of a Chance-conducting would his destiny appear so lucid, or so singularly directed as to have his many vain desires forestalled, or so happily translated into a "better building than he himself designed." He recognizes, that by a superior ordering, no greater benedictions were allowed to descend, than he could utilize and appreciate, and thereby have prevented a larger bliss. Never could his weaknesses and faults, which he may not recall without grief, have been so happily over-ruled, apart from the control of God's Fatherly Love. And though he could not trace a Divine Superintendence by any special milestones, throughout his personal life, yet were there still a thousand reasons left him, to rest his creed upon, that he is not an orphan in God's Universe. His origin, his capacity to know and love his Maker, his endeavors to reverence and obey Him, the consciousness of being in a vastly different moral relation to his Maker, from the blasphemers, all such considerations pre-

vent him from conceiving of God, as a Being like unto a callous and haughty tyrant, wholly indifferent and heartless of His offspring.

If we assume, moreover, that the Creator from eternity discerned His plan with all the possible changes involved, and ordained the Laws of Nature, with all their potencies and functions, acting in perfect keeping with His prescribed order, both in the physical and moral worlds, is not all our discussion of a Providential government a mere logomachy, since it virtually amounts to an exclusion of God's direct influence on the universe?

Certain naturalists, maintaining a special Providence, nevertheless, hold that God's Omnipotence and Omniscience may be all the more becomingly vindicated by assuming that the Universe is upheld through the innate energies which the Creator implanted in all his creatures by His *Fiat* in the genesis of things.

But assuming the Creator as the original and primary source of the Universe, with all its Laws and Forces, on which the momentary existence of all depends, is it in any sense derogatory also to hold, that He likewise supplies these channels and means with their efficiencies, by a method so Divine as to be wholly incomprehensible to us? It is true, an artizan does not originate and sustain the energy which moves his mechanism; this is apart from himself. His whole part lies in the proper adjustment of all its members. But since the entire organism of Nature is God's product, is it not more reasonable also to hold that from Him too emanates its vitality? In view especially, of the numberless remarkable phenomena and striking coincidences, which appear over the realm of Nature, and which can hardly be satisfactorily interpreted by the mere Law of Motion, His immanency is more consistently predicated. How many inexplicable secrets lie along the border-line of the Law of Reproduction, in any other theory, both of animate and inanimate beings! The acute Lord Bonnet indeed affirms, that our imagination alone shrinks from accepting the Evolution theories, whilst his reason bravely concedes

their intelligible explanations. But is not every evolution scheme somewhat too mystical too for Reason's acumen? *E. G.* The seed of the first created apple must have been many million times less than the tree, from which the seed of the second tree evolved, which was again a billionth less. Yet the original seed, we are asked to believe, embodied the essential parts of all the embryos of the entire race of apple-trees descended from it, down to the end! Whilst it is confessed, that our senses are not the measure of matter, or of its immensity, since that which seems infinitely small to man, may strike another species as infinitely large; still, the realm of mystery is truly opaque, even if Reason applies the theory of evolution to its keen eye; if we but adjust the lens for the purpose of understanding the plastic growth of a mutilated earth-worm. Bonnet holds, that Nature surrendered her world of mysteries entire to his distinguished fellow-townsmen, whilst analyzing a fertile egg. And whilst acknowledging that Nature may never have unbosomed her treasure-trove more freely to any eye, than she revealed it to the piercing gaze of his bosom friend, may we not safely believe, notwithstanding that mother Nature yet holds some of her secrets to herself? He discerned the rudimental embryo of a bird in its original state, in its gradual formation, in the separating, approximating, dividing and recombining process and final organization. But is the conclusion, then, an infallibly safe one, that all its essential parts were actually at hand in its genesis, and only invisible because of their transparency? The profound naturalist tells us only what he observed, and leaves all inferences and conclusions for his thoughtful readers. The *evidence* of a fact, and the *testimony* of it, are not one and the same by any means. "Evidence" is the impression which a phenomenon makes on our senses; whilst "testimony" is the impression which our reports make on other minds. A Wolff discerned so many cells in a rudimentary leaf; and also noticed their vergings towards and from each other; their whole process of adjustment into a perfect leaf. So far he affords no evidence. But when he

concludes, that its plastic formation is owing solely to constitutional motion, he renders us only his testimony, and must permit us to ask, Whence was the *first impulse*? Whence that uniformity of all similar leaves, in the absence of all Creative efficiency? And, in the case of animals and mankind—on what exclusively mechanical laws may we intelligently account for the fixed ratio between the sexes in the face of countless caprices?

By virtue of the Divine Influx the Sons of Nature remain animated and efficient. Man errs, however, when he views them as relief measures, whereby God would spare Himself the task of upholding the Universe. In the eye of mortals only are they means, through which the Creator renders His motives active and proves His Power and Wisdom.

It were possible for God to set the same efficiency to flow directly into all creatures, independent of secondary *media*, as readily as to originate them by His Will; but a Universe that were upheld by an unbroken series of miracles, or the ceaseless exertion of Will-power directly inbreathed into every creature, would not enhance His Majesty or challenge the wonder of mankind the more. The Universe were a dream-work, in which man could not foreknow the Creator. Intelligence and design a moment in advance. But a sovereign does not abdicate his crown, though he governs his empire through subordinate Laws of Government. And must we exorcise and banish the Creator from His Universe because He originated and ordained the Majestic Laws of Nature?

Man's moral freedom is withal not infringed on. The Creator ever sees the end from the beginning, the effect in the cause—every conceivable act, result and relation; He provides for the maturing of all events which are not ultimately antagonistic to His Universal Plan; He allots the measure of forces and channels; He includes His moral creatures—their motives and conduct. Yet is not moral freedom annihilated, since man is not a subject of Unconditional Decrees. Men may elect both motives, means and ends whilst God remains sovereign

over all. He is Sovereign over means, in that He suffers only such to be adopted, or to such a degree, or under such relations, as cannot militate against His ultimate Designs. And so also does He remain Sovereign over motives and ends. Such as conflict with the universal good, He may not suffer to be conceived; He may frustrate; He may annihilate, by contrary ones, which are equally free. There are a thousand ways by which His Sovereign Will will carry the victory over the freely concerned motives, and voluntarily conducted and consummated deeds of man's own device, without laying an embargo on the creature's liberty, In all cases we may conceive of man as a free agent, and as acting spontaneously, and yet in no instance as standing beyond His limitations—as morally free, as if God had left him wholly to himself.

Is there any good ground for believing that the Creator of the Universe should have deprived Himself of all authority, whereby He may awaken such conceptions in His intelligent and free creatures, as shall work together for the consummation of His Sovereign pleasure, without, at the same time, robbing them of that characteristic which constitutes mankind the master-piece of His Handiwork?

NOTE.—This Essay is mainly built up from the suggestive works of a Theologian of the last century—John Frederick Wilhelm, Jerusalem.

concludes, that its plastic formation is owing solely to constitutional motion, he renders us only his testimony, and must permit us to ask, Whence was the *first impulse*? Whence that uniformity of all similar leaves, in the absence of all Creative efficiency? And, in the case of animals and mankind—on what exclusively mechanical laws may we intelligently account for the fixed ratio between the sexes in the face of countless caprices?

By virtue of the Divine Influx the Sons of Nature remain animated and efficient. Man errs, however, when he views them as relief measures, whereby God would spare Himself the task of upholding the Universe. In the eye of mortals only are they means, through which the Creator renders His motives active and proves His Power and Wisdom.

It were possible for God to set the same efficiency to flow directly into all creatures, independent of secondary *media*, as readily as to originate them by His Will; but a Universe that were upheld by an unbroken series of miracles, or the ceaseless exertion of Will-power directly inbreathed into every creature, would not enhance His Majesty or challenge the wonder of mankind the more. The Universe were a dream-work, in which man could not foreknow the Creator. Intelligence and design a moment in advance. But a sovereign does not abdicate his crown, though he governs his empire through subordinate Laws of Government. And must we exorcise and banish the Creator from His Universe because He originated and ordained the Majestic Laws of Nature?

Man's moral freedom is withal not infringed on. The Creator ever sees the end from the beginning, the effect in the cause—every conceivable act, result and relation; He provides for the maturing of all events which are not ultimately antagonistic to His Universal Plan; He allots the measure of forces and channels; He includes His moral creatures—their motives and conduct. Yet is not moral freedom annihilated, since man is not a subject of Unconditional Decrees. Men may elect both motives, means and ends whilst God remains sovereign

over all. He is Sovereign over means, in that He suffers only such to be adopted, or to such a degree, or under such relations, as cannot militate against His ultimate Designs. And so also does He remain Sovereign over motives and ends. Such as conflict with the universal good, He may not suffer to be conceived; He may frustrate; He may annihilate, by contrary ones, which are equally free. There are a thousand ways by which His Sovereign Will will carry the victory over the freely concerned motives, and voluntarily conducted and consummated deeds of man's own device, without laying an embargo on the creature's liberty, In all cases we may conceive of man as a free agent, and as acting spontaneously, and yet in no instance as standing beyond His limitations—as morally free, as if God had left him wholly to himself.

Is there any good ground for believing that the Creator of the Universe should have deprived Himself of all authority, whereby He may awaken such conceptions in His intelligent and free creatures, as shall work together for the consummation of His Sovereign pleasure, without, at the same time, robbing them of that characteristic which constitutes mankind the master-piece of His Handiwork?

NOTE.—This Essay is mainly built up from the suggestive works of a Theologian of the last century—John Frederick Wilhelm, Jerusalem.

VII.

THE FOOLISHNESS OF PREACHING.

BY N. C. SCHAEFFER, PH.D.

WITH alarming frequency we hear the assertion that preaching belongs to the lost arts. It is claimed that men generally are not benefited by the sermons they hear; that modern preaching does not stir the heart and quicken the soul so as to impel the hearers to lead better lives; that it signally fails to inspire the masses with loftier ideals, with stronger motives and more powerful incentives than those which the world furnishes.

To some extent these claims may be founded in fact. They are no doubt made upon the basis of personal experience. They are uttered sometimes as an excuse for not going to church, but more generally with the sad feeling that these things ought not so to be. Therewith is coupled the temptation to throw all the blame upon the pulpit. The simplest remedy that suggests itself is to starve out or drive off the preacher, in the hope that better luck will attend the next call; or, if this cannot be done, to wander from church to church, in the hope of at last finding the right man. If the desired success does not attend any of these efforts, the conclusion is accepted that preaching is one of the lost arts.

The passage in 1 Cor. 1:22 shows that already in Paul's time some people considered preaching a piece of foolishness. The Corinthians, who were versed in the wisdom of Greek philosophers, were not all satisfied with the preaching they heard. When Paul preached on Mars-Hill, at Athens, some mocked; others said, We will hear him again. Only a part of his

audience was willing to come back and hear him a second time. John the Baptist, although he drew large crowds, did not succeed much better than Paul. There were hosts among his hearers who were not moved by the Baptist's call to repentance. Our Lord Himself, who spake as never man spake, failed to reach all His hearers so as to induce them to embrace His offers of truth and salvation. In these cases the blame cannot be laid upon the preachers. One was the Model Man; the other two were divinely called. The cause of the ineffectiveness of their preaching must have been in the hearers. Evidently, if a listener finds that a sermon does not lay hold of his inner life, he should first inquire whether the fault is not in himself, rather than in the message to which he is listening.

Preachers deserve more sympathy than they usually receive. The public lecturer is often praised because he is more interesting or more entertaining. Those who have tried lecturing as well as preaching know the difference from experience. A sermon should no more be compared with a lecture than the vegetation of your wheat-field with the recent cyclone at Reading, Pa. The lecturer spends half a year in preparing what he is to say. The sermon, on the contrary, is not an occasional thing, like a cyclone or a lecture. The lecturer is expected to furnish information or amusement, which the audience would otherwise not get; the sermon should deal with the central truths of Christianity, which are well known. The lecture has the charm of novelty; the lecturer meets a new audience every night. The sermonizer must meet the same audience Sabbath after Sabbath; he must comfort the same mourners year after year. Neither medicine nor law makes such constant drafts upon the productivity of the brain. Luther, after the delivery of one of his earlier sermons, told Staupitz that preaching would kill him in three months. Robertson, whom Dean Stanley called the best sermonizer in the English tongue, used to roll on the floor in intense agony, after the delivery of his sermons. Dean Stanley was himself called to pass through the experience of those who in early life are

blessed as the messengers of truth, but who in later days lose their hold upon the people. When one thinks of the magnitude of the task of speaking to the same audience week after week, upon familiar themes; of the listlessness which is apt to follow the wearing off of the charm of novelty, instead of blaming the men in the pulpit, one must rather feel surprise at the measure of their success, and the conscientious layman will seek rather to help them by a proper preparation of himself to hear the preached word.

All preaching is teaching, the latter being the wider term. Teaching is the act of communicating truth of any kind. In teaching mathematics, we communicate the truths of quantity. In preaching, we communicate saving truth. Hence preaching is the highest form of teaching. If men fail in the lower forms of instruction, is it to be expected that there are to be no failures in this, the highest form of instruction? The same causes of failure exist in each. Some students fail to learn because they go to class with certain prejudices against those who teach. Here lies a prolific source of failure. A Massachusetts chaplain was compelled by General Butler to preach in a Presbyterian Church at Norfolk to an audience of people who were also there by the general's orders. How to overcome the prejudices in their minds was the first problem to be solved by the chaplain. He began: "My friends, I am here by no choice of mine. I came to your city as chaplain to look after the souls of my neighbors, who are here, as I am, under military orders. I stand in the place of your honored pastor by command of my military superior; but I am a preacher of the same Christ whom you possess, and I ask you to hear me for His sake." He had, it is said, a respectful hearing for the next three months. Unfortunately, the preacher does not always know the hindrances in people's minds, and hence cannot thus adroitly remove them. In such instances the hearer should himself lay them aside.

Pupils may exhaust themselves by midnight study, or by base-ball. The best teaching will then not reach the mind.

How often people go to church with their mental powers jaded or even exhausted! Brain-workers are constantly in danger of coming to the house of worship unfit, mentally and physically, to engage in its services. A parallel we find in the habit of some people, who read a chapter of the Bible just before going to bed. The Holy Book may then seem stale and insipid, because they are too tired to read. The fault does not lie in the Sacred Scriptures, but in the reader himself.

Many pursuits destroy the mind's receptivity in other directions. Professor Bain says: "When Drawing is pursued so as to become a taste and a fascination, it is too engrossing; it disturbs the balance of the mind and indisposes for other tasks." He then goes on to show how painting and drawing may unfit the mind for the abstract and analytical procedure of science by imparting a too exclusively pictorial character to the intellect. The exclusive training of the eye and the hand may unfit us to take in truth by the ear. Paul hints that the interest of the Corinthians in the wisdom of the philosophers unfitted them for getting any benefit from what they were pleased to call the foolishness of preaching. Our daily life, our habits of thought, may unfit us for hearing the message of the gospel. Every student should take warning from the lamentable experience of Darwin.

People often go to church with unwarranted expectations. They seek what it is not the office of the pulpit to give. For instance, it is not the aim of the true preacher to amuse by sallies of wit, or by a brilliant display of rhetoric, or by a show of scholarly erudition. Some one has said that there are many roads in England, but they all lead to London. In the Bible there are many texts, but they all lead to Christ. Whoever comes to church for any other purpose than that of hearing about Christ's mediatorial work, deserves to be disappointed. If the truth concerning Christ and Him crucified does not edify the soul, something has gone wrong in the inner life of the hearer.

This brings us to the saddest sight which can be witnessed at

church—that of a soul hungering for the bread of life, and being fed upon the husks of rhetoric, elocution or dialectics. After all, it will not do for the clergy to cast upon the people all the blame for the failure of their pulpit efforts. The major part of the blame is to be laid upon their own habits of life and thought, and upon their false conceptions of what constitutes success in public speaking. No amount of gesticulation and no tricks of the voice, however skillfully executed, can atone for the lack of inner depth and earnestness. What the heart has not felt, the lips cannot utter with telling effect. In this respect many sermons are masterpieces of foolishness. The attention of the listener is drawn away from the thought, and directed to the figures of speech, to the graceful gestures, to the intonations of the voice. With each new effort to succeed, the delivery becomes more artificial, more abominable. Theremin's theory, that eloquence is a virtue, not a fine art; that the success of a speaker is to be measured by his ability to influence the will of his hearers, would save our preachers from a multitude of sins. When people return from church praising the learning or the delivery of their minister, it is *prima facie* evidence that he has failed. Of Him who spake as never man spake, the Scriptures tell us nothing in regard to style of speaking, except that He sat and taught the people; but we read that the multitudes were astonished at His doctrine, at the substance of what He uttered. They had no inclination to think of aught else when He opened His lips. The ideal of public speaking includes a mode of utterance so natural and so faultless that the audience forget all about the speaker and think only of what he is saying. This ideal was realized in Jesus, whom we might style the Great Preacher, with the same propriety with which He is called the Great Teacher.

The aim to make the audience forget all about oneself and to influence their hearts and lives by making them think exclusively of what is said, must exert a most beneficial influence upon the habits of study which a young preacher forms. It will cause him to lay less stress upon externals and to attach

more importance to graver pursuits, such as tend to furnish him materials with which to edify the people. Whilst he will be in the world he will not be of the world, but the current of his thinking will be directed heavenward and toward Christ, from whom he will seek inspiration, moral force and energy of will.

Congregations seeking pastors, have a strong preference for young men. In view of this fact some one who had himself grown gray in the profession, recently made the facetious remark that when a minister of fifty is without a charge, it would be a kindness to hit him on the head with a club as one no longer wanted on the earth. Perhaps this preference of our congregations is more excusable than it appears at first sight. The young man usually leaves the Seminary feeling that he has a message which he must deliver. The success of his early efforts often spoils him for life. For as soon as he gets away from the stimulating atmosphere of the school of the Prophets, the ideas and thoughts which force their way into the chambers of the soul partake of the nature of things temporal and earthly. If cherished and harbored during the hours of study, these soon sink into the hidden depths of the soul and fill the ante-chamber of consciousness with things worldly and unholy. What is thus thrown into the alembic of the mind is recombined into new forms, and the individual is often surprised, sometimes horrified at the ideas and thoughts which thereupon reappear spontaneously above the plane of consciousness. Is it strange that such a man gets no ideas which serve to edify the people? Is it to be expected that holy and inspiring thoughts shall well up from the hidden depths of a soul that receives only things worldly and unholy? The preacher cannot be too careful in guarding the sub-conscious life of the soul.

St. Philip Neri claimed that if he had a dozen really detached men he would soon be able to convert the world. What is a detached man? John Henry Newman explains it thus: To be detached is to be loosened from every tie which binds the soul to the earth, to be dependent on nothing sublunary, to

lean on nothing temporal; it is to care simply nothing what other men choose to think or say of us or do to us; to go about our own work, because it is our duty, as soldiers go to battle, without a care for the consequences; to account credit, honor name, easy circumstances, comfort, human affections just nothing at all when any religious obligation involves the sacrifice of them. How can this rare virtue of *detachment* be attained? In the degree and to the extent that a man gets close to his Saviour, in that degree and to that extent does he become a detached man. Was this not the secret of Paul's success? The student of the gospels may daily listen to Christ's words, observe His method of communicating truth to the multitudes, and imbibe the spirit of fervent charity which permeated all His acts as well as His spirit of self-sacrifice which has been the admiration of men in every age and clime. The preacher with these habits of study need seldom commit the folly of uttering with his lips what was never in his heart, and although his preaching, like St. Paul's, may appear to some as a piece of foolishness, to others it will be a message unto salvation.

VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

ATONEMENT.—SOTERIOLOGY. The Sacrificial, in Contrast with the Penal, Substitutionary, and Merely Moral or Exemplary Theories of Propitiation. By S. G. Burney, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Cumberland University. Pp. xvi. and 400. Cumberland Presbyterian Publishing House, Nashville, Tenn., 1898.

This work consists of a series of lectures delivered by the author to the theological classes of Cumberland University. It is divided into three parts, the first containing a review of Christian Soteriology, the second treating of the Nature of Atonement, and the third of the Extent of the Atonement. The subject of the last part is treated only briefly, as the author's conclusion, that the atonement is universal, follows necessarily from his general position.

The general drift of the thought of the book is indicated with sufficient clearness in the title-page. It is an argument against the theories of penal substitution, of governmental expediency, and of moral influence, and in favor of the doctrine of *propitiatory sacrifice*, the term sacrifice being, of course, taken in a sense entirely different from that which it bears in the theory of Anselm. The reasoning of the book proceeds throughout on scriptural principles and is based on scriptural data. It is, therefore, not liable to the charge of being philosophical only and not scriptural. The author, who is a keen logician, possessing evidently a legal turn of mind, in whose case the title of LL.D. has some real significance, subjects the theories which he opposes to a most searching criticism in the light of Sacred Scripture; and, in contrast with the views which he rejects, brings out his own doctrine, especially in the second part of the book. Those who believe that the theory of vicarious punishment, or of penal suffering, has an impregnable foundation in Scripture, will not only find this book to be exceedingly interesting and instructive reading, but they will discover also that the theory in question has really no better basis in the Bible than it has in reason.

Against the current theory of the atonement as a satisfaction of divine justice by the suffering of the penalty of sin on the part of the sinless Christ, the author conducts a most keen, and we believe entirely successful, polemic. He shows that the notions of moral substitution, and of the imputation or transference of guilt and righteousness from one moral agent to another, are contradictory,

and therefore self-destructive, conceptions. The notion of guilt, for example, is a mere abstraction without reality, when considered as something separate and apart from the person of the agent whose guilt it is. And the same is true of the notion of righteousness. Guilt is a condition of the person, resulting from the wrong exercise of his will, which condition God cannot, by an arbitrary fiat, connect with another person. God, then, could not impute the guilt of Adam to his posterity; nor could He impute the guilt of humanity to Christ, and then punish Him in our stead. This would be to confound and blot out all moral distinctions.

Nor, again, is it possible for one person to *assume* the guilt of another and *voluntarily* to suffer the penalty for him. Penalty, guilt and criminality are inseparable conceptions; and no one can bear another's penalty, because no one can become guilty of another's crime. Moral substitution, whether voluntary or involuntary, according to Dr. Burney, is a psychological impossibility. "Whatever else another may do for me, he can never take my conscience or mental states and make them his own, and give me his conscience and mental states in return. As easily could he impart to me his own personality and take mine" (p. 241). And yet, if one reflects for a moment, he will come to see that that is precisely what moral substitution would mean. On the subject of *voluntary penalty* our author says: "As passive obedience is a contradiction in terms, so is voluntary penalty an absurdity; for voluntariness and penalty are mutually exclusive. If you pay a fine imposed as punishment upon a friend for crime, you are not his substitute. Your payment is not a penalty, but a benefaction to a friend. Penalty and benefaction differ as widely as the poles" (p. 195).

The suffering of Christ in our behalf, and for our sins, according to Dr. Burney, was in the nature of a benefaction, not in the nature of a penalty. It was a voluntary surrender of His life in our behalf; but a penalty is never a voluntary action on the part of him who suffers it. The sufferings of Christ were in the nature of a sacrifice; but a sacrifice never has the character of a penalty. With the sacrifice of Christ God was well pleased; it was to Him an odor of a sweet smell (Eph. 5: 2); but the contemplation of punishment can afford God no pleasure. "All sacrifices," says our author truly, however strangely it may sound to some ears, "are acts of religious worship. No acts of religious worship are or can be penal. . . . Sacrifice is an act expressive of obedience, reverence, love to God. Penalty is an expression of God's displeasure against the disobedient" (p. 234). The sacrifice of Christ, then, is to be regarded as an ethical act—not a *passive obedience*, in the sense of the suffering of penalty—but an ethical act or deed, in which His life of obedience, or of supreme love to God and man, came to its perfect culmination.

As an ethical act, or series of ethical acts, the sufferings of

Christ had a significance first in relation to Himself. It was the condition of the perfection of His moral character as the Mediator or Saviour. It served to make Him perfect as the author of our salvation. "The doctrine here (Heb. 2: 10) plainly taught is not that Christ's sufferings in any way save men, but by His suffering He became what He is, namely, the author of salvation. His death did not destroy sin, or the devil, but through His death He became the antidote, the destroyer of sin" (p. 199). Again: "What He did and suffered is referred to (in Scripture) only as the essential conditions by which He became what He really is—a living personal Saviour, who justifies and saves by imparting His own nature to those united to Him by faith." "It is the living Christ, not the dead, that justifies, that saves" (p. 255). This thought, that it is the living Christ, not His sufferings, nor His death, nor His teaching, nor His example, that saves the sinner, recurs in a great variety of forms in the book under notice, and is set forth with an earnestness and vigor which remind us of the way in which the same great truth has in times past been presented in the pages of this *Review*.

But the suffering of Christ has a meaning and purpose also in relation to God. In this regard it has the character of a propitiation—is a propitiatory sacrifice. "It propitiates in some sense, so that God may be merciful without being unjust—that He may pardon without inflicting punishment" (p. 310). It has this propitiatory character, however, not as being the payment of the penalty of sin for others, but as being the supreme act of perfect obedience on the part of Christ Himself, an obedience which He owed God for Himself as Mediator, and with which God was well pleased. "The sacrificial death of Christ seems to propitiate, because it was an act of perfect obedience—obedience unto death—which, as a sacrifice, was to God a sweet-smelling savor" (p. 310). To the question, how this act of obedience can have such propitiatory effect upon the divine mind, the author replies that omniscience alone could give a perfectly satisfactory answer. He adds, however, that the fact is no more mysterious than is the fact that the obedience of a child is pleasing to the mind of a parent, or the fact that the confession of an offence tends to take away the indignation of the offended party. "What God has made an indigenous law of the human mind and a rule of conduct," he says, "is perhaps a characteristic of His own mind, and a rule of His own administration."

The idea of propitiation, however, is not fulfilled merely in the death of Christ. It becomes real and effectual for sinners only through repentance and sanctification, of which it is the indispensable condition. "Christ, through obedience unto death and His resurrection, becomes the propitiation or medium, through whom God, or the Holy Spirit, operates upon men, and through whom men have access to God." "His propitiation has its inception in His obedient and sacrificial death, and its completion, or life-giving

power, in His ministrations as the living Christ" (p. 357). To the question, how the divine pleasure can come to rest upon the sinner in consequence of the propitiation of Christ, Dr. Burney's answer would be, that this is possible only inasmuch as that propitiation carries in itself the possibility of the sanctification of the sinner and the formation in him of a Christ-like character through vital union with Him. He repeatedly calls attention to the analogy between Adam and Christ, and maintains that, as the former has corrupted the race by communicating to it his depraved nature, according to the law of heredity, so Christ, who is a quickening Spirit, regenerates and sanctifies it by the communication to it of His sanctified nature. The sinner, then, is justified, or made righteous, not by the *imputation* of Christ's righteousness, which would only make him *putatively*, not *really*, righteous, but by an *impartation* of the righteousness of Christ. "God recognizes those that believe in Jesus as righteous, simply because they are made partakers of Christ's righteousness—not imputed, but imparted. Christ is literally the Lord our righteousness" (p. 309).

Here, however, is a point at which we believe some caution is required, and at which Dr. Burney's view needs to be further elaborated. How are we to think of this impartation of righteousness? This might be conceived in such a way as would bring us back to the notion of that logical realism, which would make of the conception of righteousness a substantial reality, capable of being separated from the person whose possession it is, and given to another—a notion against which Dr. Burney rightly contends all through this book. The idea of the impartation of Christ's righteousness must, then, not be understood as if the moral quality of Christ formed a certain divisible and separable quantity, from which a part might be taken and given to another; as the blood, for example, may be taken from the veins of one individual and infused into those of another. The expression can have a sound sense only when understood to convey the idea that the sinner, through a spiritual and ethical communion with Christ, is led to form the same moral character that belongs to Christ. One man can impart his character or his virtues to another only by inducing that other to reproduce those virtues in himself by his own personal activity. The impartation of righteousness from Christ to the sinner cannot take place through a physical, but only through a moral process; though at the basis of this moral process, and conditioning it, there must be supposed a transcendental divine operation or influence affecting human nature in a way to counteract the vitiating influence derived from the first Adam. Of course Dr. Burney would agree to this; for he says that "the Second Adam, having, through obedience unto death, and being raised to newness of life, become a life-giving Spirit, or source of spiritual life, imparts His spiritual life without any divarication or diminution of His own life to all

that believe on Him" (p. 351). But we would have been glad if at this point the theory had been more fully developed.

Our space forbids us to pursue the subject any further. We have given the salient features of the book before us, as far as possible, in the author's own words. Though we do not think that we have done the book an injustice, yet we recognize the fact that it is difficult to do full justice to such a work, on such a subject, in a short notice. Owing, no doubt, to the manner in which the book originated, namely, as a series of lectures to theological students, it abounds somewhat in repetitions, and is perhaps somewhat defective in the arrangement of the material. These are, however, not serious blemishes, and the general theological reader will not object to them. The earnest student who desires light on a difficult subject, and who in theology cannot be satisfied with fictions, but demands reality, will give this book a hearty welcome, and read it with interest and profit.

W. RUPP.

HISTORY OF GERMAN THEOLOGY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By F. Lichtenberger, Dean of the Faculty of Protestant Theology at Paris. Translated and Edited by W. Hastie, B. D., Examiner in Theology, University of Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 33 George Street, 1889. New York: Scribner and Welford. Price \$5.60.

In Protestant and progressive theology Germany occupies the most advanced position and exerts the greatest influence on the religious thought of the age. Nearly all the leading theologians of the nineteenth century have been her sons and teachers in her universities. Some knowledge of German theology has therefore become an absolute necessity to the theological student and to all who are interested in the progress of theological science. In view of this fact the work before us may be said to supply a real want, deeply felt for some years by educated ministers not well versed in the German language. Of the work itself the translator in his preface very truly says: "It is the work of a singularly gifted and qualified scholar, who has brought the fullest knowledge and the most patient industry to his task. Grounded not only upon a conscientious study of the sources of the subject, but upon faithful reference to all that has been lately written worth reading upon it, it is pervaded at the same time by a living sympathy for all that is highest and most enduring in modern theological thought, and its representations and judgments are restrained and guided by an independent critical faculty and an earnest regard for practical Christian truth. It is written not only with the full mastery of a matured and vigorous mind, but with the easy grace, the penetrating insight, the keen discrimination, the luminous characterizations, and the clear style of the accomplished French writer. And if more may be needed to commend it, it may be allowable to add that it has been tested throughout by reference to the original

German literature and has been found to be unfailingly correct and reliable."

The historical contents of the volume are divided into two periods, the first extending from Schleiermacher to Strauss (1799-1835), and the second from Strauss to the present time (1835-1888). The first division consists of a short introduction sketching briefly the influence of political events and the movement of philosophy, and of seven chapters treating, respectively, of "The Old Schools of Rationalism and Supernaturalism," "Schleiermacher," "The Disciples of Schleiermacher," "The New Orthodoxy," "The Speculative School," "Schiller," and "The Lyrical School." The second division is made up of an introduction and eight chapters. The subjects of the different chapters are, "Strauss," "The Radical School," "The New Biblical Criticism," "The New Lutherans," "The School of Conciliation," "The New Liberal School," "The New Kantian School," and "The Catholic Theology." In an appendix brief sketches of a number of German divines are given. The treatment of the various subjects considered though concise is nevertheless clear and satisfactory. The information given is throughout of a highly desirable and valuable character, and indispensable to the proper understanding of the religious thought of our times.

In addition to its many other merits the work has also the rare merit of being admirably translated. Its sentences are unusually smooth for a treatise of its kind, and free from all obscurity. We heartily commend the work to our readers as well worthy their attention and careful study.

LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF PREACHING. By the late Rev. John Ker, D. D., Professor of Practical Training in the United Presbyterian Church. Author of *Sermons: "The Psalms in History and Biography,"* &c., Edited by Rev. A. R. Macewen, M. A. Balliol, B. D. Glasgow. Introduction by Rev. Wm. H. Taylor, D.D., LL.D., New York. A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway, 1889. Price \$1.50.

The author of this volume, the Rev. Dr. John Ker, was an eloquent and distinguished Scotch preacher who during the last ten years of his life (from 1876 to 1886) filled the chair of Practical Training for the Ministry in the Theological Seminary of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland. It was in the discharge of his duties as a theological instructor that he delivered the twenty-one lectures given to the public in the handsome and attractive book before us.

Of these lectures the first is introductory and points out the benefits to be derived from a proper and careful study of preachers and preaching. The second traces the ancestry of preaching to the prophetic teaching of the Old Testament; and the third treats of the earliest Christian preaching. The five lectures that follow, give the history of preaching from the days of the Apostles down

to the days of Martin Luther. In them the prominent characteristics of the Oriental Church preaching, earlier and later, of the Western Church preaching, and of the preaching immediately before the Reformation of the sixteenth century are portrayed in an instructive manner. The next twelve lectures are devoted to a somewhat full and critical consideration of German preaching since the Reformation. Both its excellencies and its defects are clearly set forth. In the concluding lecture are gathered together some counsels for guidance in preaching drawn chiefly from the survey of German preaching between the Reformation and our own time.

All the lectures are written in a clear and forcible style, and abound in important and interesting historical information. At the same time, however, in every lecture much practical instruction is also imparted. The volume will, accordingly, be found especially valuable to theological students and to ministers of the Gospel generally. Much may be learned from it as regards both the best way of preaching and the qualities which make it most effective in advancing the kingdom of God on earth and in preparing men for eternal blessedness and glory.

THE SECOND BOOK OF SAMUEL. By the Rev. Professor W. G. Blaikie, D.D., LL.D., New College, Edinburgh. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. Price, \$1.50.

This volume forms "part of what is known as 'The Expositors' Bible.' It is not a regular Commentary on the portion of Scripture of which it treats, in which verse after verse is explained and critical details are considered, but is a series of Expositions in which all needful explanations are furnished and the spiritual and practical teachings of the inspired narrative are emphasized. The work is one of superior merit. The period of Israelitish history to which it relates is an important and interesting one, and Professor Blaikie's treatment of it is unusually instructive and suggestive. The book is especially well suited to supply the needs of the ordinary readers of Scripture, and will be found highly stimulating and edifying by all who are truly interested in the teachings of the Word of God. To those engaged in the Sunday-school work this volume, together with the volume on the First Book of Samuel, by the same author, will be of the highest service in their preparation for teaching the International Sunday-school Lessons for the ensuing six months.

THE BOOK OF ISAIAH. By the Rev. George Adam Smith, M.A. In two volumes. Vol. I. Isaiah i.-xxxix. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. Price, \$1.50.

This volume belongs to the same series as the one just noticed. Like the other volumes of the series, it is expository in its character and designed to appeal to the conscience of its readers. The

Exposition does not, however, observe the canonical arrangement of the chapters, but follows an arrangement which embraces all the prophecies, but treats them in chronological order. For pursuing this course the author gives a very good reason. "No book of the Bible," he tells us, "is less susceptible of treatment apart from the history out of which it sprang than the Book of Isaiah; and it may be added, that in the Old Testament at least there is none which when set in it its original circumstances and methodically considered as a whole, appeals with greater power to the modern conscience. Patiently to learn how these great prophecies were suggested by, and first met, the actual occasions of human life, is vividly to hear them speaking home to life still."

In expounding the Book of Isaiah as he has done, the purpose of the author has been "to enable English readers not only to follow its course, but to feel, and to be elevated by, its Divine inspiration." The Exposition itself is based, he informs the reader in the Introduction, upon a close study of the Hebrew text; and the translations throughout are his own, except in one or two cases where he has quoted from the revised English version, to whose value he bears strong testimony. As the scholarship of the author is unquestionable, his work is not only very attractive, but also truly valuable. No one, we think, who will carefully study it can fail to be delighted and greatly benefited by its lucid and impressive expositions of the important and inspired utterances of that eminent Old Testament Prophet, of whom it has been very truly said: "He comes nearest to the New Testament, and is more frequently quoted than any other." The book is well worth a place in any library. In Great Britain it has already reached a second edition.

THE SERMON BIBLE. I Kings to Psalm lxxvi, New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway, 1888. Price \$1.50.

This is the second volume of a series, to be completed in twelve volumes, which is designed to present in a convenient form the essence of the best homiletic literature as a help to ministers in the preparation of their sermons. Under every text given will be found: 1. Outlines of important sermons by eminent preachers, which exist only in manuscript or periodicals, and are thus inaccessible. 2. Less full outlines of sermons which have appeared in volumes not easily obtained. 3. References to sermons to be found in popular volumes likely to be in a preacher's library. 4. Full references to theological treatises, commentaries, etc., which elucidate the text. A minister after having chosen his text can, therefore, refer to these volumes and learn how it has been treated by eminent divines and where further information concerning it may be obtained. If properly used the work may no doubt be made to subserve a useful purpose and be of real value to the

minister possessing it. One of the merits of the outlines given in the volume before us, is that they cannot well be used without being carefully thought over and reconstructed.

THE BEGINNINGS OF ETHICS. By Rev. Carroll Cutler, D.D., Formerly President of Western Reserve College, New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1889. Price \$1.25.

This is a masterly treatise. On the subject to which it relates, we, indeed, know of no work of superior merit. It is entitled "The Beginnings of Ethics" because it treats rather of Ethical origins than of the details of Ethical philosophy and practice. Its purpose is to show how Ethics arises psychologically and logically out of the nature of the soul and the necessary assumption of its thought and action. This purpose it accomplishes in an unusually clear, vigorous and satisfactory manner. In its pages the very latest views that have been advanced on ethical questions, as well as the earlier views, are noticed and briefly but fairly considered.

For use in higher institutions of learning, as a manual for study, it will be found an admirable book. In his preface Dr. Cutler indeed states that it grew up from studies carried on in connection with the instruction of college students, and has been given to the public because its conception of Ethics and its way of presenting the subject seemed so stimulating and helpful to many successive classes. At the same time, however, it is also suited to the wants of students of Ethics generally, and will be found by them to be much more than a dry text book. For our part it is some time since we read a more instructive and attractive work on so profound a subject.

From the following brief outlines some idea of the contents of the book may be formed. In the first chapter, which is of an introductory character, the nature and field of the science are considered. To the question, "What, then, is the Ethical?" the author gives the answer: "It is the whole field of the obligatory, both positive and negative. It is that in reference to which I can say, as an intelligent, self-consciously acting being, or person: 'I ought;' 'I ought not;' 'I am bound, or under law, in respect to my choice and acts;' 'There is something higher than my impulses and choices even,—an imperative authority which I cannot shake off, an ideal, controlling principle above me and independent of me;' 'It is that which the sense and thought of duty, obligation, right, good, have reference to, and enjoin or forbid'." "*The conception of duty*," he holds, "is an *à priori* principle of the mind, matching, in the intellectual sphere, the practical sense of duty in the sphere of the sensibilities." "The Ethical in its general nature," he holds moreover, "must be the same for all Ethical being,—just as the *intellectual* or the Elementary principles of reason are the same for all rational beings." A complete presenta-

tion of Ethical science, he says, would include three parts. The first part would be the psychological, the second would treat of speculative or theoretical Ethics, and the third of practical Ethics. In chapter second he presents a psychological outline. The powers of the soul he gives, as the Intellect, the Sensibility, and the Will. In the fifteen chapters that immediately follow he discusses the two latter powers. Under the head of the Sensibility he treats of the appetites, the desires, the affections, the susceptibility to pleasure and pain, and the nature and reality of the Moral Sense and of the theories concerning the nature of conscience. In the chapters on the Will, he defines the nature of Will and of Motive and discusses the freedom of the Will and the scope of the Will. The concluding six chapters of the book treat, respectively, of the relation of the intellect to morality, of virtue and vice, of our duties, of the criteria of conduct, of rights, and of goods. Though the treatment of these various subjects is necessarily concise, it is nevertheless complete and free from all obscurity. The book is the fruit of ripe scholarship. There is no chaff in it, only winnowed grain.